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PREFACE.

In my Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, it was laid down: that The true apocalyptic name of the Secular Roman Empire, respecting which so many various conjectures have been hazarded, is the word АПОСТАТΗС.

I. My remarks on the subject were brief: and certain difficulties, chiefly in regard to the greek character as used in the time of St. John, which have since occurred to me, were left unnoticed.

I may add: that the rationale or principle, on which, I think, a sober expositor, if he wish to produce any thing reasonably satisfactory, ought to proceed, was not stated and
discussed with the measure of fulness which the subject justly requires.

II. These defects it is my present object to remedy.

That the word \textit{ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΗΣ} is really the name in question, I was fully persuaded, in my own mind, even at the time when I published my \textit{Sacred Calendar of Prophecy}. But, at present, my conviction is such, as to amount to a sort of moral certainty. Nor can this impression be deemed irrational, when I state: that the very difficulties, which occurred to me, tended only, when thoroughly sifted, to establish, with the greater firmness, the original position.

III. The subject is both curious and important: curious, in the discussion; important, in the consequence which it involves.

1. Commentators have too frequently gone to work after a manner, which can scarcely fail of exciting distrust and suspicion.

(1.) Often, little regarding, or even misap-
prehending, the palmary fact, that, *Let the precise name be what it may, it is a name descriptive of the Secular Roman Empire;* they have pitched upon some individual or some object disagreeable to them: and have then endeavoured to find a plausibly appropriate name, which, in its arithmetical letters, should comprehend the specified number 666.

The natural consequence of this crude system, a system common alike to Papists and to Protestants, has been: that names of the most opposite tendency have been confidently brought forward on no better argumentative or probative ground, than that, when arithmetically computed, they contained the number required.

(2.) Yet the Apostle himself affords no reason for the sneer, which such a loose mode of procedure is doubtless not unlikely to provoke.

So far from making *the production of a certain definite number* the sole test, by which
the actuality of the name is to be determined; a test, in truth, had it ever been *nakedly* propounded, which *in itself* would absolutely have been *no* test: St. John lays down not fewer than *five* distinct notes, by the combination of which a test of such a highly complex nature is produced, that it is morally impossible for more than a *single* name to correspond with it.

Whence, if we find a name, which really *does* correspond with this complicated quintuple test, and which at the same time characteristically describes the theological condition of the Secular Roman Empire from first to last; we are morally sure, that we have detected the name beheld by the Apostle: for, through the intervention of such a process, all that charge of vagueness and ambiguity, which is often alleged against inquiries of this description, will, on abundantly reasonable principles, be effectually removed.

2. The subject, however, is no less awfully important, than it is intellectually curious.
If recapitulated apostasy, as Irenæus denominates it, be the branded theological character of the Secular Roman Empire, in its divided state as well as in its undivided state, from its commencement even down to its termination, under its nominally christian polities as well as under its avowedly pagan polities: I do not perceive, how the conclusion can be escaped; that That corrupt form of Christianity, which has long been upheld and patronised by the potent Western Bishop of Rome, though it had been germinating in the East from certainly as early a period as the fourth century, is no better than a gross apostasy or departure from the sincerity of the genuine Gospel.

Such a conclusion, particularly when viewed in connection with the well known prophecies, that A great apostasy in the Church must needs be expected, and that That apostasy would be eminently marked by a prohibition of marriage and a devotion to idols and a return in a new
form to the old pagan practice of subordinately worshipping the souls of illustrious dead men canonised or (as the Greeks called them) Demons or Hero-gods: such a conclusion may well administer a salutary caution to those, who, in the present age of sickly liberalism, vainly fancying that Popery is no longer what once it was, are tempted to make shipwreck of their faith by listening to the artful insinuation of well disguised plausibilities.¹

Popery, whatever wizard the theological Proteus may wear, and however dexterously it may seek its advancement by pandering to the wild licentiousness of democratic faction, is still, in the judgment of Holy Writ, a form of recapitulated Roman Apostasy.

¹ See 2 Thess. ii. 3—12. 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. Rev. ix. 20.
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CHAPTER I.

THE CHARACTER AND VARIOUS FORMS OF
APOSTASY.

The fall of our first parents was itself an apostasy: and, from that time, though the Seed of the woman was both originally promised and ultimately manifested to recover man from apostasy, his inveterate tendency to it has still been the same in every successive generation.

I. Before the deluge and after the fall, the earliest apostate, from that alone system of religion which could be suitable to the necessities and the condition of a lapsed creature, was the fratricide Cain: and his apostasy,
spreading far and wide as mankind increased upon the face of the earth, at length infected all save the family of Noah.

1. It consisted in a proud rejection of that mode of reconciliation, which the wisdom and goodness of God had appointed for the fallen.

Through the future sacrifice of the Incarnate Word, atonement was at length to be made *efficaciously*; and, as a perpetual acknowledgment of man’s sinfulness united with a perpetual prospective recognition of the appointed method of his recovery, atonement was again and again to be made, *typically* and *figuratively*, through a constant succession of bloody animal sacrifices.

2. By Cain, this mode of reconciliation was contemptuously rejected. Bringing a vegetable offering, instead of the divinely ordained animal offering; that is to say, bringing a mere eucharistic oblation which expressed no necessity of an atonement, instead of an expiatory sacrifice for acknowledged sin and transgression: he denied, that he stood in any need of a propitiation; and thus, with a
high hand, he apostatised from the revealed doctrine of the atonement.

3. His children, and finally the whole world save the family of Noah, lapsed after his example: and so utterly hopeless in its very nature, was this peculiarly offensive and insulting apostasy (which, in truth, with reference to revealed religion, is no other than palpable infidelity), that it brought upon a systematically incurable race the necessary doom of utter excision¹.

II. After the deluge, that scheme of religion, which alone is suitable to a fallen creature, was taught and upheld in the preserved family of Noah: and the recent tremendous punishment of inflexible apostasy was so far efficacious, that never again has there been an universal lapse into that infidel plan of self-sufficient theology, which is professedly based upon a rejection and a denial of the doctrine and the necessity of an atonement.

¹ See this subject discussed at large, in my Treatise on the Three Dispensations, book i. chap. 1, 7, and in my Treatise on the Origin of Expiatory Sacrifice, sect. iii. chap. 2.
1. Yet many generations had not passed away, ere the descendants of the second great patriarch again apostatised, though their apostasy was of a totally different species from that of Cain and the antediluvians.

Instead of rejecting the doctrine of an atonement and instead of deriding the need of the promised Saviour, the Noachidae at Babel, with mischievous ingenuity, made those vital matters the very ground-work of their new apostasy.

They taught: that The Seed of the woman had already been incarnate in the two great patriarchs of the two successive worlds; that He would hereafter repeatedly be incarnate in each expected similar great patriarch of each expected similar world; and, moreover, that He both had been incarnate, and would again be incarnate, in numerous remarkable personages, beside those preëminent mundane patriarchs who were transmigrative reappearances of one and the same great universal father.

With these speculations, they united the necessity of expiatory sacrifice: and to such
an extent did they carry the last doctrine, that, as the most perfect imitations of the grand predicted sacrifice, they esteemed human oblations to be of all others the most acceptable and the most efficacious.

2. On such principles was built the Hero-Worship or the Demonolatry of the postdiluvian Gentiles: and to it was, at the same time, added the subordinate superstition of Sabianism and Materialism.

(1.) From Babel to every part of the globe carrying with them their early speculations, they adored those illustrious deceased mortals who had flourished at the commencement of each world; venerating them on the specific ground, that They had severally been an avatar or descent or transmigrative incarnation of the Filial Deity.

(2.) But, additionally maintaining that Their souls after death were translated to the heavenly bodies of which henceforth they became the philanthropic regents, the new apostates readily engrailed upon Hero-Worship the dependent and connected worship of the Host of Heaven.
(3.) Holding, furthermore, that The great father was the animating principle of the Universe, they were thence led also into the philosophising reveries of a specious Materialism.

(4.) And, at length, partly through the love of objects which apply themselves directly to the senses, partly through a vain affectation of symbolical mystery, and partly on principles regularly deduced from the materialising system, they were led to all the absurdities and abominations of Animal-Worship and Image-Worship ¹.

III. For the mingled purpose, of gradually weaning mankind from this complex apostasy, of preserving the knowledge of the true God in the midst of a surrounding artificial darkness, and of keeping up a legitimate expectation of the promised Deliverer, the Israelites were remarkably selected from the rest of mankind, and the Levitical Dispensation was introduced.

FORMS OF APOSTASY.

But, though a people was thus peculiarly chosen and appropriated, that people, notwithstanding their extraordinary privileges and advantages, still shewed the same fatal disposition to apostasy as that which characterised their idolatrous neighbours. They did not, indeed, absolutely forsake the worship of Jehovah, any more than the Gentile Patriarchal Church did in the first stage of her declension: but they added to it the worship of the Baalim and the Siddim; which worship was the adoration of canonised dead men, venerated as the regents of the Host of Heaven, and supposed to pervade by their energies the whole organised world of matter.

IV. At length, for the more effectual reclamation of an apostatic race, and to accomplish that atonement the idea of which had since the catastrophè of the deluge never been lost or relinquished, the true promised Seed of the woman became incarnate, and introduced that pure system of religion which was to be offered to all the Gentiles and which in due time was to be universally diffused and
accepted. Yet still even the personal advent of the Redeemer himself did not wean the fatuity of mankind from their aboriginal disposition to apostasy.

1. Great as was the purity of primitive Christianity, that purity was of no long continuance.

(1.) It was foretold by an Apostle: that, *In the latter times, some should apostatise from the faith.*

The apostasy of these persons, therefore, was plainly, by the very terms of the prophecy, to be an apostasy from sound Christianity.

And, in the same prediction, it was distinctly announced: that, *In point of character, this apostasy from the faith of the Gospel should consist in attending to error-teaching spirits and to doctrines concerning demons.*

The apostasy, therefore, of the persons foretold (as Epiphanius, even in the fourth century, rightly understood the passage ¹),

¹ According to Epiphanius, the meaning of the place is: *that The persons, foretold by St. Paul as apostatising from*
was to be an apostasy to the worship of demons or canonised dead men, similar in principle, however different might be the objects, to that ancient postdiluvian pagan apostasy into which the Israelites were so perpetually lapsing

(2.) By the same Apostle it was yet additionally foretold: that, As an apostasy in the Christian Church should assuredly come; so

the faith, shall be worshippers of dead men; even as dead men were formerly worshipped in Israel. And the drift of his interpretation is fully illustrated by the circumstance of his reproving, in connection with the prophecy, the practice of certain of his contemporaries, who invoked the Virgin Mary as a potent goddess the Queen of Heaven. Epiph. adv. hær. lib. iii. hær. 78.

1 1 Tim. iv. 1. On this familiar import of the word Demons, is plainly, I think, founded the greek translation of Psalm xcvi. 5.

'Ορι πάντες οί θεοί τῶν θεών ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ· ὁ δὲ Κύριος τοῦς αθραντός ἐποίησεν.

According to the universal voice of antiquity, all the gods of the Gentiles, however their worship might be associated with Sabianism and Materialism, were originally and properly canonised dead men. Hence, in their version, the Seventy state them to be Demons.
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the coming of that apostasy would be marked
and attended by the revelation of an extra-
ordinary person, whom he variously de- 
minates The Lawless One and The Man of Sin
and The Son of Perdition.

This person, thus connected with the apop-
sasy from the faith, is plainly its Chief or
Spiritual Head.

Whence, as the ringleader and teacher
of the new race of apostates, he may well
himself be preëminently styled The Apos-
tate.

But, though an apostate from the faith by
teaching the doctrines of canonised dead men,
he is an apostate only in the same sense as
the ancient Israelites were apostates. He
does not altogether relinquish the worship of
the true God: for he is described, though
after a mode the most unseemly, as sitting in
the temple or church of God, and thence ob-
viously as professing to be a christian pastor.
But to that worship he adds the subordinate
worship, of what the Apostle styles Demons,
or of what Epiphanius justly interpreted
to denote the souls of dead men canonised¹.

(3.) According to the prediction, so has been the event.

This apostasy of the Christian Church from the pure faith of the Gospel, chiefly under the patronage and influence of the great Roman Patriarch of the West, is not a matter of mere invidious speculation: unhappily, it is a naked fact, recorded by History, and open to universal observation.

The Christians of the seventh century, says Mr. Gibbon, had insensibly relapsed into a semblance of paganism. Their public and private vows were addressed to the relics and images, that disgraced the temples of the East. The throne of the Almighty was darkened by a cloud of martyrs and saints and angels, the objects of popular veneration: and the collyridian heretics, who flourished in the fruitful soil of Arabia, invested the Virgin Mary with the name and honours of a goddess. Intemperate

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4. See my Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, book i. chap. 4.
curiosity and zeal had torn the veil of the sanctuary: and each of the oriental sects was eager to confess, that all, except themselves, deserved the reproach of idolatry and polytheism. Under the successors of Constantine, in the peace and luxury of the triumphant Church, the more prudent Bishops condescended to indulge a visible superstition for the benefit of the multitude: and, after the ruin of Paganism, they were no longer restrained by the apprehension of an odious parallel.

The first introduction of a symbolic worship was in the veneration of the cross and of relics. The saints and martyrs, whose intercession was implored, were seated on the right hand of God: but the gracious and often supernatural favours, which, in the popular belief, were showered round their tomb, conveyed an unquestionable sanction of the devout pilgrims, who visited and touched and kissed these lifeless remains, the memorials of their merits and sufferings.

But a memorial, more interesting than the skull or the sandals of a departed worthy, is a
faithful copy of his person and features delineated by the arts of painting or sculpture. At first, the experiment was made with caution and scruple: and the venerable pictures were discreetly allowed to instruct the ignorant, to awaken the cold, and to gratify the prejudices of the heathen proselytes. By a slow though inevitable progression, the honours of the original were transferred to the copy. The devout Christian prayed before the image of a saint: and the pagan rites of genuflexion, luminaries, and incense, again stole into the Catholic Church. The scruples of reason or piety were silenced by the strong evidence of visions and miracles: and the pictures, which speak and move and bleed, must be endowed with a divine energy, and may be considered as the proper object of religious adoration. The use and even the worship of images was firmly established before the end of the sixth century: they were fondly cherished by the warm imagination of the Greeks and Asiatics: and the Pantheon and the Vatican were adorned with the emblems of a new superstition.
The worship of images had stolen into the Church by insensible degrees: and each petty step was pleasing to the superstitious mind, as productive of comfort and innocent of sin. But, in the beginning of the eighth century, in the full magnitude of the abuse, the more timorous Greeks were awakened by an apprehension, that, under the mask of Christianity, they had restored the religion of their fathers. They heard, with grief and impatience, the name of idolaters; the incessant charge of the Jews and Mohammedans, who derived from the Law and the Koran an immortal hatred to graven images and all relative worship. The eloquence of the monks was exercised in the defence of images: but they were now opposed by the murmurs of many simple or rational Christians, who appealed to the evidence of texts and of facts and of the primitive times, and who secretly desired the reformation of the Church.

1 Gibbon's Hist. of Decline and Fall, vol. ix. p. 261, 262, 114—116, 121, 122. See also Mede's Apost. of the latter times. Works, p. 693; Middleton's Letter from Rome,
2. Largely synchronical with this demonolatrous apostasy, and indeed provoked by its passim; and my own Difficulties of Romanism, book i, chap. 6. book ii. chap. 6. 2d edit. with Supplement to Diffic. of Romanism, chap. i.

If we seek any more modern proof of the incorrigible idolatry or the gross demonolatry of the Roman Church, we have it, ready to our hand, and under an authority which no Papist will dispute, in the Encyclical Letter of the present Pope Gregory XVI, dated at Rome, from St. Mary Major's, August 15, A.D. 1832.

But, that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea the entire ground of our hope. May she exert her patronage to draw down an efficacious blessing on our desires, our plans, and our proceedings, in the present straitened condition of the Lord's flock. We will also implore, in humble prayer, from Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and from his fellow Apostle Paul, that you may all stand as a wall to prevent any other foundation than what hath been laid.

Here, as exhibited by the Pope himself, we have the authorised Popery of the nineteenth century. Here we may see revived, in all its undisguised offensiveness, the idolatrously blasphemous Colyridian Heresy, so justly stigmatised by Epiphanius as a βλάσφημον πράγμα. Here, associated with the direct adoration of the Virgin, as our greatest hope, yea as the entire ground of our hope, we may note a professedly
incorrigible offensiveness, there has been yet another apostasy of a nature in some respects even still more deleterious.

(1.) Christ appeared, not only as the prophet of the Most High, but likewise as the incarnate Deity who should make atonement for the sins of mankind.

In avowed opposition to him, started up a humble prayer, in which this Arch-Apostate directly implores, from Peter and from Paul, the power of standing firmly upon the foundation, alleged (I suppose) to have been laid by Christ, but really laid by the perverse industry of a lamentably corrupt Communion.

The common evasion, copied from Bossuet, that Romanists do not worship the Virgin and the Saints, but that they merely beg their intercessory prayers at the throne of grace, will not, in the present passage, avail. It cannot be too often repeated, that, in the year 1832, Mary has, by Pope Gregory himself, been declared to be the greatest hope, yea the entire ground of the hope, entertained by his most deplorably ill-taught flock: nor should it ever be forgotten, that the same Pope recommends, to the same flock, the imploring in humble prayer, from two of the Apostles, the grace of pretended Christian steadfastness.

If this be not rank unblushing idolatry, the word idolatry is a word without meaning.
simulated prophet, who claimed to be his superior, who boldly denied his godhead, and who renounced his proffered atonement.

(2.) Here again we may note the wretched tendency of man to the sin of apostasy.

Mohammedism, instead of being rejected with horror as an insult to God, has already prevailed full twelve centuries: and, in point of number, its deluded adherents probably even exceed the followers of the Messiah.

3. Eminently antichristian, however, as is the apostatic character of Islamism, a lower depth of iniquity still remained to be explored.

(1.) The first form of apostasy, that of the antediluvians, was an infidel rejection of a divine revelation: the last form of apostasy, as witnessed to a tremendous extent in our own days, is substantially the same presumptuous Infidelity, aggravated by the circumstance of an open rejection of the promised Seed of the woman even subsequent to his actual epiphany.

(2.) This is the very consummation of apostasy: and, since the predicted character
of the Antichrist is that He should deny or renounce both the Father and the Son, the spirit of Infidelity is that spirit of the Antichrist, which shewed itself indeed even in the apostolic age through the medium of the early Gnostic and Ebionitic Heresies, but respecting which St. John prophetically warned the whole Church Catholic as about at some future time to be eminently and remarkably developed.

V. Thus, from the very fall of Adam, has our unhappy race again and again been marked with the deep and broad brand of determined apostasy.

1 1 John ii. 22. iv. 3.
CHAPTER II.

THE BLASPHEMOUS CHARACTER OF THE GREAT APOSTATE EMPIRE, WITH WHICH, AT THE ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH, AND SUBSEQUENT TO HIS ADVENT, CHRISTIANITY CAME CHIEFLY IN CONTACT.

The Messiah was revealed, and the Gospel began to be preached, in the days of the Roman Empire.

I. That mighty Sovereignty, thus closely connected with the Church of God, could not be passed over in the divine oracles.

1. The fourth great kingdom upon earth, or the Empire which is fourth in relation to the three prior successive Empires of Babylon and Persia and Macedon, is described, in the symbolical prophecies of Daniel, under the hieroglyphic of a ferocious wild-beast, fur-
nished with teeth of iron and with claws of brass, but peculiarly characterised by having ten horns\(^1\).

That this symbol shadows out the Roman Empire, is, both from Chronology and from circumstantial evidence, so plain, that the justice of the application has been unani-
mously recognised by all, whether ancient or modern, whether papist or protestant, whether jew or christian. Hence, as Mr. Mede not ill remarks, such an application of the symbol is all but an article of faith\(^2\).

2. The same hieroglyphic, with a more full and exact description of its form, appears again in the Apocalypse of St. John\(^3\).

Its identity is established, both by its place in chronology, and by its remarkable character of bearing ten horns: but, as comprehending and absorbing the dominions of its three predecessors, it receives into its

\(^{1}\) Dan. vii. 7, 19, 23.

\(^{2}\) See my Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, book iii. chap. 2.

\(^{3}\) Rev. xiii. 1, 2.
composition the mingled figures of the babylonian lion and the medo-persian bear and the macedonian leopard; and, as having subsisted or as being destined to subsist under seven distinct supreme polities or modes of government, it is conspicuously marked by having seven heads

3. Here, then, symbolically represented, we behold that mighty Roman Empire, with which, both at and after the advent of the Messiah, Christianity came specially in direct contact.

II. The general character of the Roman Empire is strongly exhibited in the hieroglyphic and is fully recorded in history.

But there is a particular point of its character, to which St. John peculiarly calls our attention: because, as I apprehend, while other points are injurious only to the externals of Revelation; this, through the medium of actual corruption, is injurious to its very spirit and principle.

1. The symbolical wild-beast, from first to

1 See my Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, book v. chap. 4.
last indicative of the Roman Empire, is said to utter blasphemies: and he is represented, as opening his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle and them that dwell in heaven ¹.

Hence, agreeably to this account of his conduct, he is described, as appearing externally full of names of blasphemy, or as bearing names of blasphemy imprinted upon all his seven heads: by which expressions we are plainly to understand, not that he bore the stigmata of many different blasphemous names branded variously upon his seven heads, but that he bore impressed upon them many repeated stigmata (one stigma to one head) of that single name of blasphemy which is elsewhere styled the name of the wild-beast².

2. Thus, from a comparison of Scripture with Scripture, we learn: that The bestial symbol of the Roman Empire had a name impressed upon him, as specially his own, and

¹ Rev. xiii. 5, 6. ² Rev. xvii. 3, xiii. 1, 17.
as specially descriptive of his character; which name was the name of blasphemy.

1 In Rev. xiii. 1, the common reading is, singularly, δυὸμα βλασφημίας, the name of blasphemy; but Griesbach prefers the plural reading, δυὸματα βλασφημίας, names of blasphemy.

To my purpose, the variation is immaterial: for one name of blasphemy was plainly impressed upon each head; and, since (as we learn from Rev. xiii. 17), the wild-beast had, in the vision, no more than one name, emphatically written τὸ δυὸμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, this one name must be the name of blasphemy seven times repeated, or, as the Apostle speaks, names of blasphemy.

I. Some commentators have unskillfully fancied; that The name of the wild-beast, mentioned in Rev. xiii. 17, is the name, not of the first or ten-horned wild-beast, but of the second or two-horned wild-beast. And the serious evil of this mistake has been; that It has occasionally led them to select names, such as vicarius filii dei or vicarius dei generalis in terris and the like, utterly and inherently inappropriate.

Now it is true, that incidentally, the second wild-beast, as being collegiately identical with the Man of Sin, participates in the name really alluded to by the Apostle: but the name itself, as specially propounded and as primarily (at least) assigned by St. John, is doubtless the name of the first wild-beast or the wild-beast conspicuously distinguished by his seven heads and his ten horns.

II. In
And thus, since this name is said to be many times repeated by being branded upon

II. In this manner, accordingly, though some have unaccountably blundered in their adjudication, the name is applied by all our best expositors: and it is a point too clear to admit of any reasonable dispute.

1. Let any person carefully peruse Rev. xiii. 11—18: and, from the strict continuity of the narrative, he will clearly perceive; that The wild-beast, mentioned in ver. 17, 18, is the same as the wild-beast mentioned in ver. 12, 14, 15: in other words, he will clearly perceive; that The wild-beast, to which the proprietorship of the name is ascribed, is the first not the second, wild-beast.

2. To the same result he will be brought, by attending to Rev. xiv. 9, 11, and Rev. xx. 4.

In these passages, the name of the wild-beast, which is the impressed mark or character of the wild-beast, is described as appertaining to that particular wild-beast for whom an image had been made. But the particular wild-beast, for whom, at the instigation of the second wild-beast, an image was made, was undoubtedly the first wild-beast. See Rev. xiii. 3, 11, 14. Therefore the first wild beast is that, to whom the name properly and primarily appertains.

3. Accordingly, as the first wild-beast is specially said to have a name, and as the brand or impress of that name is said to be his mark or character: so, in the pictorial description of the hieroglyphic, that same name, under the additional appellation of the name of blasphemy, is consistently
every one of his seven heads, and since such a repetition cannot have been made without due reason, we may further learn: that, *Either wholly or partially, either in this region or in that region, either more intensely or less intensely, the character of blasphemy appertains to the Roman Empire alike, as existing under each of the seven polities represented by the seven heads of the symbol.*

III. The sum, in short, of the whole matter, is this.

Whatever, in letters and in syllables, may be the precise word intended by the Apostle; the name of blasphemy is the name of the wild-beast: and that name is branded upon all the seven heads of the symbol, for the purpose of indicating; that the religious principles and practice of the Roman Empire, under all its seven successive polities, both had been, and would be, BLASPHEMOUS.

said to be branded upon all his seven heads, insomuch that he appeared to be even full of the repetition. Compare Rev. xiii. 17. xiv. 11, with Rev. xiii. 1. xvii. 3.
CHAPTER III.

IMPORT OF THE TERM BLASPHEMY.

From such a statement, to which we are distinctly brought by the terms of the prophecy, an important question will obviously arise.

What are we to understand by that blasphemy, which, from first to last, should so remarkably distinguish the Roman Empire?

I. That the blasphemy of the fourth great Kingdom, under all its seven successive political, should, according to the common familiar acceptation of the word, import an outrageous attack upon the majesty of God marked by all the horrid concomitants of open defiance and raving profaneness, is clearly impossible: for the pagan Romans, according to their own mistaken views of pious obligation, were, in truth, a religious people; and, after the con-
version of the Empire to Christianity, the papal Romans, however they may have apostatised from the sound faith of the Gospel, have at least not indulged in the atrocity of open and resolute and barefaced impiety.

Doubtless, in these present dregs of time, we have witnessed the ebullition of blasphemy even in the strictest force of the word's ordinary acceptation. But, while this may be justly deemed a species, it cannot be deemed the comprehensive genus, of Roman blasphemy: because the name of blasphemy was imprinted in common upon all the heads; and yet these latter days only of the Empire have been distinguished by the frequent blasphemy of profane and daring infidelity.

Hence it is evident, that the blasphemy, ascribed to the Roman Empire under all its seven forms of polity, must be something much more comprehensive than a mere single species. The name must be a generic name, aptly descriptive of the Empire's shifting religious character under every one of its successive different modes of government.
II. Let us see, then, whether there be not a sense of the term BLASPHEMY, recognised in God’s word and thence familiarly adopted in the Church, which will exactly meet the appropriating phraseology of the inspired Apostle.

1. In the language of the Bible, blasphemy is apostasy: a blasphemer is an apostate: to blaspheme is to apostatisē.

2. Such is the phraseology of Scripture. Whence, very naturally adopting it, Epiphanius styles the apostasy of the Collyridian Heretics, which was an apostasy from sound Christianity to the worship of the Virgin Mary, a blasphemous deed: and, analogously, he considers the whole transaction as an impious change or departure or apostasy from the preaching of the Holy Spirit.

1 Isaiah lxv. 7. Ezek. xx. 27—32. Acts vi. 11, 13, xiii. 45. xxvi. 11. 1 Tim. i. 13, 19, 20. 2 Tim. iii. 2, 5—8. James ii. 7. Rev. ii. 9.

2 ΒΛΑΣΦΗΜΟΝ πράγμα.

3 "Ὅπερ τὸ πάν ἄσιν ἀσθενείς καὶ ἀθεμοῦν ΗΛΛΟΙΩ-ΜΕΝΟΝ ἀπὸ τοῦ κηρύγματος τοῦ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος..."
III. Now here we have a *generic* sense of the word *blasphemy*, which is of sufficiently extensive application: for the comprehensive term *apostasy* denotes a *departure from* or a *rejection of* sound religion, in whatever *specific* mode that departure or that rejection may operate.

St. John, therefore, in ascribing *blasphemy* to the Roman Empire as it subsists under every one of its seven successive polities, distinctly ascribes to it the sin of *apostasy* or *departure of rejection*.

At *one* time or in *one* district, the apostasy may differ, in form, from the apostasy of *another* time or *another* district. There may be variations, also, in point both of object and of malignity and of intenseness. But still ὡστε εἶναι τὸ πάν διαβόλων ἱνάργημα καὶ πνεύματος ἀκαθάρτου διδασκαλίαν. Πληροθεῖται γάρ ἵπτος τὸ, ἈΠΟΣΤΗΣΟΝΤΑΙ τῶν τῆς ὑγιῶν διδασκαλίας, προσ- ἐκοντες μόθοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαμολοίων."Εσονται γάρ, φησί, νεκροὶς λατρεύοντες, ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ ἰσεβάθ- θησαν. Ἐπιφ. adv. hær. l'ıı. hær. 78.
the *general* character, ascribed to the Empire, is that of an *apostasy from sound religion* or of a *departure from the faith* or of a *rejection of the Gospel*. 
CHAPTER IV.

THE VARIOUS FORMS OF APOSTASY WHICH HAVE CHARACTERISED THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Such an ascription is certainly a very serious and a very awful matter. For, if, from first to last, and as subsisting under all its seven successive polities, the great Roman Empire has been blasphemous or apostatic: it will be important to inquire, both what have been the different religious systems maintained during its continuance, and how those different religious systems must be alike deemed apostatic or blasphemous.

I. Simply, then, as a matter of fact, it is indisputable: that, In the course of its long continuance occidental and oriental, the Roman Empire, as subsisting under its seven successive political heads, has been marked by the various characters of Pagan Demonolatry and Christian
Demonolatry and Mohammedism and Infidelity.

From the construction of the symbol, therefore, we are compelled to admit: that The several systems of Pagan Demonolatry and Christian Demonolatry and Mohammedism and Infidelity are but different forms or species of what is generically termed blasphemy, or apostasy. For, unless all these different systems be different forms of blasphemy or apostasy, the prophetical hieroglyphic will cease to be an accurate representation: because, in that case, one or more of the seven heads will not bear impressed upon it the nationally indicative name of blasphemy.

II. Accordingly, with this necessary result, the real character of those different schemes will be found exactly to agree.

The general stigma of the Empire, as provincially subsisting under all its successive polities, is the broad mark of apostasy.

From apostasy the genus, then, let us descend to those various roman forms which severally constitute the species.
1. Pagan Domonolatry is an apostasy, from primitive Patriarchism, to a singular compound of Hero-Worship and Sabianism and Materialism.

2. Christian Demonolatry, according to the accurate prophetic description of St. Paul, is an apostasy, from the faith of primitive Christianity, to a sort of partially revived Paganism under the name and form of Saint-Worship and Image-Worship and Relic-Worship.

3. Mohammedism is an apostasy, from the religion of the Gospel, to a pretended revelation from heaven, which supersedes the Messiah, and which sets up an impostor as his divinely appointed superior.

4. Infidelity is an apostasy, from all revealed religion, to an open contempt of God's word, to an insulting rejection of his Son, and

---

1 Christians, says the voice of History, had relapsed into a semblance of Paganism. Under the mask of Christianity, they had restored the religion of their fathers. Gibbon, as cited above, chap. i. § iv. 1. (3.)
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to a proud disallowance of his appointed method of reconciliation.

III. This fourth and worst form of apostasy, which when universally received brought about the destruction of the irreclaimable antediluvians, we have seen, in our own days, both widely diffused and actually embodied within the territories of the Roman Empire: and, though Pagan Demonolatry be now extinct within those limits, the two other apostatic forms of Mohammedism and Christian Demonolatry still continue to subsist.

IV. But, perhaps, the strict and proper apostasy of the Empire, its apostasy, to wit, from at least comparative soundness of doctrine and purity of worship, will appear in a yet more striking point of view, if we recollect: that, originally and during the first hundred and seventy years of their infant Republic, the Romans had no images in their temples; being persuaded that it is impious to represent what is divine by what is perishable, and that we can have no conception of
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God save through the medium of the understanding.

1. For the full establishment of this primitive way of thinking and this primitive mode of worship, they were greatly indebted to Numa, who was a Pythagorean: and Pythagoras himself, who, according to Plutarch, taught, that The First Cause is not an object of sense and liable to passion, but invisible and incorruptible and by the mind alone discernible, is, by Clement of Alexandria (who has borrowed the preceding account of early Rome from Plutarch), supposed, not improbably, to have received light from the books of Moses during his travels in the East.¹

2. The same account of early Rome is given by Varro: who remarkably subjoins, that, if the Romans had persevered in their pristine abhorrence of image-worship, or, in other words, if they had not apostatised from the doctrine and practice of their forefathers,

their worship would have been more chaste and holy. So far, however, as facts are concerned, the Romans, he distinctly states, did not hand down the error of polytheistic image-worship from their primeval ancestors: but, on the contrary, they themselves superadded it to the old doctrine and practice.¹

V. Well, therefore, and justly, is the one generic name of Blasphemy or Apostasy branded upon all the heads of the great Roman hieroglyphic: because, from first to last, whether subsisting under the Imperial Kingship, or under the Consulate, or under the Dictatorship, or under the Decemvirate, or under

the Military Tribunate, or under the Triumvirate, or under the short-lived Francic Emperorship, the Empire, at this time or at that time, wholly or partially, in this region or in that region, according to this form or according to that form, has never ceased to be characterised by the bestial mark of what Irenèus calls RECAPITULATED APOSTASY.
CHAPTER V.

THE ENIGMATICAL APPELATION OF THE
APOSTATE ROMAN EMPIRE.

According to the express determination of
St. John, the name of the wild-beast,
that name which the Apostle beheld and read
conspicuously branded upon all the seven heads
of the Roman Hieroglyphic, is the name of
blasphemy or the name of apostasy.

I. Hence, whatever may be the precise
word which constitutes that name, nothing can
be more idle, than the common expositorial
practice of pitching upon this title or upon
that title which may aptly characterise the ob-
ject of the commentator's dislike, whether the
selected title be MAOMETIS OR LATINUS OR
ROMIITH OR LUTHER OR CALVIN OR BEZA, for
no better reason, forsooth; than because its
aribhmetical letters, in Greek or in Latin or in Hebrew, happen, when summed up with the occasionally unfair dexterity of requisite graphical management or needful unscrupulous additament, to bring out the fatal number of six hundred and threescore and six.

1. The bearers of such appellations, whether national or individual, we may admire or we may reprobate, as we most affect: but, clearly, the naked appellations themselves, in respect to their proper verbal import, are not names inherently significant or descriptive of blasphemy.

All such names are either mere personal or mere gentile names. In themselves, they are no more expressive of apostasy, than any other gentile or personal appellations: and an individual may safely, on the one hand, bear the name of Latin or Romaine, without being what Protestants deem a gross idolater; and, on the other hand, he may no less safely bear the name of Luther or Calvin, without being what Papists deem a manifest heretic.
2. Accordingly, it is a palpable absurdity to say: that either MAOMETIS or LATINUS or ROMIITH or LUTHER or CALVIN or BEZA, even if (what, however, is far from being the case) each of these names were in no other respects objectionable, can be the Name of Blasphemy, which, as expressing the religious character of the Roman Empire under all its seven polities from the time of Romulus down even to the present day, was alike branded upon all the seven heads of the bestial hieroglyphic.

II. Fully to discuss and point out the untenableness of the various names, which have been crudely propounded by the wantonness of expositorial licence, would be at once unprofitable and wearisome. Yet, as a specimen of the facility with which their claims to any serious notice may be annulled; on the two names MAOMETIS and LATINUS, since they seem to have been the most general favourites, I shall offer a few additional remarks.

1. The mode, in which the word MAOMETIS has been proposed as the name of the wild-
beast, would at least be plausible, if the principle, upon which its patrons fall to work, were itself solid and well-founded.

(1.) With perfect truth, no doubt, they urge: that The second apocalyptic wild-beast is styled the false prophet. Now, of him who is specially the false prophet opposed to Christ the true prophet, Maometis, they tell us, is the greek appellation: and the greek letters of the word Maometis, when arithmetically computed, will be found exactly to contain the fatal number 666. Therefore, say they, we have a strong presumption, a presumption well nigh amounting to a certainty, that Maometis is the name in question.

All this would at least be plausible, if the name were distinctly set forth as the name of the second wild-beast or as the name of the wild-beast denominated the false prophet. But, unfortunately, the advocates of the present speculation have completely mistaken the proprietorship of the title.

The name in question is the name, not of the second wild-beast, but of the first wild-
beast. That is to say, it is the name, not of the wild-beast denominated the false prophet, but of the wild-beast distinguished by his seven heads and his ten horns.

Now the wild-beast, thus distinguished, indubitably and indisputably, from beginning to end, symbolises the secular Roman empire: and I need scarcely to observe, that, of the Roman Empire from Romulus downward, Maometis can, by no possibility, be received as the intended appellation 1.

(2.) The name Maometis may rejoice in the rare felicity of having been adduced, at diverse times, both by protestant and by popish expositors. Yet, even independently

1 Those ingenious Romanists, who have detected the ominous name of the wild-beast in Luther or Calvin or Beza, have evidently gone to work upon the very same false principle. Doubtless every zealous son of the Latin Church will be forward to pronounce, in furtherance of his scheme, each of those distinguished individuals a false prophet: but it would puzzle Bellarmine himself to shew, how either the name Luther or the name Calvin or the name Beza can be the true name, either proper or descriptive, of the secular Roman Empire.
of the falseness of the *principle* upon which they work, we may well ask: Where is the indisputably final authority, even for writing *at all*, still less therefore for *exclusively* writing, the arabic name of the impostor with the *precise* greek letters which compose the word *MAOMETIΣ*?

By the popish expositor Bishop Walnesley (who clumsily fancies, however, that *his* *MAOMETIΣ* will be some *yet future* personal Turkish Antichrist assuming or bearing the name of the Arabian Impostor) we are told: that *The word is thus written by Euthymius and Zonaras and Cedrenus*.

1 Walnesley proceeds upon the wild fancy, that we may expect a future and as yet unrevealed *personal* Antichrist, who will wear out the saints and lord it over God's heritage during the exactly defined term of 1260 *literal* or *natural* days.

2 Walnesley's General History of the Christian Church, chap. x. p. 320. Peuardentius, so far as I know, was the first who struck out *MAOMETIΣ* or *MOAMETIΣ* as the name of the wild-beast. Annot. in Iren. p. 486. But, with wise caution, he hesitates between the false prophet Mo-
Now, even if Walmesley were *accurate* in his statement: what then? *Other* historians of the later Empire express the name of the prophet of Mecca in various *other* forms. Why, therefore, for the purpose of arithmetical calculation, are we *bound* to take the alleged MAOMETIS of Euthymius and Zonaras and Cedrenus, *rather than* the MΩAMEΔ of Nicetas or the MEXMETHΣ of Chalcocondylas or the MAXEMET of Joannes Cantacuzenus or the MEXEMET of Ducas Michael or the MΩAMEΘ and the MAXOYMETHΣ of Joannes Cananus?

By reason of the essentially different principles of alphabetic writing which severally prevail in the East and in the West, scarcely any two occidentals, except by previous concert, will express a hebrew or an arabic word *perfectly* alike in greek or roman letters. Consequently, since, down to the present

...
day, the name of the grand impostor has been written in almost an endless variety of forms: those, who seek the number 666 in his name expressed in greek letters, ought first to demonstrate, that the particular form ΜΑΟΜΕΤΙΣ must, from some inherent necessity, be critically adopted, and that all the other forms must, from some inherent necessity likewise, be critically rejected. In fine, any person, acquainted with Hebrew or Arabic, will, from the very genius of those languages, readily perceive the utter improbability, that the enigmatical name, alluded to in the Apocalypse, should be an arabic word written and numbered in greek characters: because such a circumstance would make the absolute strictness of an arithmetical calculation to depend upon the inherent laxity of an alphabatical expression.

Such would be the immediate objection to the word ΜΑΟΜΕΤΙΣ, even if Bishop Walmesley had been correct in his allegation: but, where the interests of their Church either are or are supposed to be concerned, the
assertions of the Romish Priesthood must in no wise be implicitly received. Cedrenus writes the name MOYXOYMET: Zonaras writes it ΜΩΑΜΕΘ: and Euthymius, like Zonaras, also writes it ΜΩΑΜΕΘ or (as it appears in a manuscript of the Panoplia left by Bishop Fell to the Bodleian Library) ΜΩΑΜΕΔ. Not one of them writes it ΜΑΟΜΕΤΙΣ, though Bishop Walmesley assures his wondering readers, that such, with rare unanimity, is the orthography of them all.

2. With respect to the word LATINUS, even mechanically to produce the requisite number 666, it must, in greek letters, be written ΔΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ.

But, unless we can admit as a legitimate exception Irenæus himself, who exhibits the word in this greek form purely that it may give the requisite number: in no greek author extant who has not a particular object to serve, whether flourishing before the christian era or after the christian era, does the word, unless I greatly mistake, ever occur thus writ-
ten. ΔΑΤΙΝΟΣ, not ΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ, is invariably, I believe, the form of its expression. At least, I have never been able to find an exception: and certainly, though much etymological ingenuity has been employed upon the abstract merits of the case, no exception, in point of fact, has hitherto been produced.

(1.) We may cheaply say, indeed, as Dr. More actually has said; that, If ΔΑΤΙΝΟΣ be found in greek authors, it is the unskilful officiousness of some pragmatical scribe or critic that has depraved the orthography of the word.

Should such have really been the case, strange it is, that not a single place in a

---

1 The reasoning goes to prove, that, although the word be never actually written ΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ, it clearly, on the most approved principles of greek and latin grammar, ought to be thus written. See More's Synop. Prophet. part ii. book i. chap. 15. § xviii. 4. Works, p. 595, 596. Newton's Dissert. on the Proph. dissert. xxv. part ii. vol. iii. p. 233. A single example, I take it, were of more value than all the elaboration of Dr. More, though approved of by Bishop Newton.

single Greek author should have escaped this officiousness. At all events, as I have already observed, not a single place has ever yet been produced, in order to shame, by exhibiting the alleged true reading \( \Lambda \Lambda \Theta \igin \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \sigma \), the intermeddling unskilfulness which is the subject of Dr. More’s strenuous vituperation.

(2.) In truth, to a person at all acquainted with the genius of Greek orthography, the temptation of fancied corrective improvement would have lain in a way directly opposite to that which Dr. More has gratuitously imagined.

When transcribing a manuscript, or when first transferring a manuscript into print, an intelligent Grecian might have been strongly tempted to alter \( \Lambda \omicron \alpha \iota \iota \iota \omicron \omicron \sigma \) into \( \Lambda \Lambda \Theta \igin \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \sigma \), just as he would have doubtless corrected \( \theta \iota \rho \omicron \epsilon \sigma \xi \iota \alpha \sigma \) into \( \theta \iota \epsilon \iota \rho \omicron \epsilon \sigma \xi \iota \alpha \sigma \), or \( \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \iota \omicron \omicron \sigma \omicron \) into \( \rho \alpha \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \sigma \omicron \); but it is difficult to conceive, upon what Hellenic orthographical principle, he could have been tempted to alter \( \Lambda \Lambda \Theta \igin \omicron \omicron \omicron \OMICRON \sigma \) into \( \Lambda \omicron \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \sigma \); and still more difficult is it to conceive, how
every transcriber and every compositor, whose handy-work has come down to us, should have uniformly and systematically yielded to the incomprehensible temptation of corrupting EI into I. This, as Dr. More speaks, were indeed a piece of marvellously unskilful officiousness.
CHAPTER VI.

THE PHRASE, THE NUMBER OF A MAN.

The number of the wild-beast, which is defined to be the number of the name of the wild-beast, is remarkably said to be also the number of a man.

I. This peculiar phraseology has been thought to be attended with some difficulty: and the supposed difficulty has given rise to a mode of exposition, which it will be proper here to notice.

1. The imagined difficulty is the following.

If the number of a man be thought to denote the number of a man's name, such a

---

1 No man might buy or sell, save he, that had either the mark (which is) the name of the wild-beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him, that hath understanding, count the number of the wild-beast: for it is the number of a man. Rev. xiii. 17, 18.
supposition will bring out the impossible result, that _an Empire and a man may have a name in common._ For, since the wild-beast is doubtless the Roman Empire, since the number of the wild-beast is declared to be the number of some name of the wild-beast, and since the number of the wild-beast's name is also declared to be the number of a man: it is plain, that, by interpreting _the number of a man_ to denote _the number of a man's name_, we reduce ourselves to the necessity of admitting the possible identity of a name of the Roman Empire and the name of some mere individual.

2. This is the alleged difficulty: and the proposed method of avoiding it is the adoption of a different interpretation of the phrase.

In one part of the Apocalypse, occurs the phrase _The number of a man_\(^1\); in another part of the same Apocalypse, occurs the phrase _The measure of a man_\(^2\). These two phrases are pronounced to be parallel or

\(^1\) Rev. xiii. 18.  \(^2\) Rev. xxi. 17.
homogeneous. Hence it is argued: that, since the measure of a man denotes the mode of measuring practised among men, so the number of a man denotes the mode of numbering practised among men\(^1\).

II. Working on this principle, a principle approved of by Dr. More, Mr. Potter insists, that the mode of numbering practised among men, to which the passage refers, is the extraction of the square root.

Now the square root of 666, as nearly as it can be found in an integral sum, is 25.

On the strength of this calculation, Mr. Potter pronounces, that the real number of the wild-beast is not 666 simply and absolutely, but 666 computed to its square root: and he would shew the propriety of this process, partly by an allegation that the supposed parallel number of the Lamb is 144 computed to its perfect square root 12, and partly by a multitude of very curious

---

applications of the square root 25 to the Church of Rome 1.

1 See Potter's Interpret. numer. 666. Amstelod. 1677.

To give an idea of Mr. Potter's mode of antithetically applying his two square roots, 12 and 25, I subjoin Dr. More's brief abstract of the scheme.

It lights so pat upon the Romish Hierarchy, that a man cannot but be amazed at so exact a providence. For this lucky and learned writer has, out of history, made it even over clear, that Twenty-five is a character as essentially interwoven into the Hierarchy of Rome, as Twelve is into the state of the new Jerusalem. And those six main things, that this holy city is set out by in the Apocalypse, namely,

1. Twelve Gates,
2. Twelve Angels at the Gates,
3. Twelve Tribes written on the Gates,
4. Twelve Foundations with Names written on them,
5. Twelve thousand Furlongs the solid measure of the City,
6. Twelve manner of Fruits of the Tree of Life,

have their δυαδικά σώματα exactly in the Roman Hierarchy and City, namely,

1. Five and twenty Gates, whether taken literally, or mystically for Churches to baptise in,
2. Five and twenty Angels, that is, Pastors,
3. Five and twenty Titles or Parishes,
4. Five and twenty Cardinals,
5. Five and twenty thousand Furlongs, the perimeter of
III. To such a scheme, omitting minor difficulties, we may naturally object: that Mr. Potter works exclusively on the principle, that The number, in its square-root, is so the number of the wild-beast, as to be a number descriptive of his various qualities and accidents, or rather, in truth, to be a number descriptive of the various qualities

which cube is the Circuit of Rome, as the perimeter of the cube twelve thousand Furlongs is the Circuit of Jerusalem.

6. Five and twenty Articles of the Creed which should be the Food of the Tree of Life to all Believers.

In these essential matters, and in many other things beside, has he evidently shewn, how exactly the root of 666 is applicable to the Roman Hierarchy. More’s Works, p. 135.

All this is very ingenious, but to a plain man grievously unsatisfactory. The number is the number of the name of the wild-beast: and the wild-beast himself is indisputably the secular Roman Empire from Romulus down to the present day. What, then, can this number have possibly to do with the five and twenty Gates, the five and twenty Pastors, the five and twenty Parishes, the five and twenty Cardinals, the five and twenty thousand Furlongs, and the five and twenty Articles of the Creed, of the papal city of Rome and of the papal Church of Rome?
and accidents of the Roman Church; whereas the prophet specifies the number to be so the number of the wild-beast or of the secular Roman Empire, only as being the number of his name.

IV. But my present business is not to enter into any formal discussion of Mr. Potter’s system: my sole concern is to ascertain, if possible, the true import of the phrase The number of a man.

1. It is obvious, that any fancied difficulty, as to the same name being the name, at once, both of an Empire and of an individual man, cannot possibly be allowed to interfere with the abstract grammatical interpretation of a phrase.

A physical impossibility will, indeed, compel us to seek out such an interpretation of a phrase, as may not involve that physical impossibility. But, in the present case, nothing of the sort encounters us. The example of the scriptural Ashur, not to mention many other similar examples, sufficiently shews, that there is no impossibility in the
circumstance of a single man and a whole Empire being distinguished by one and the same appellation. Consequently, the alleged difficulty is not of such a description, as to compel, for the sake of avoiding it, the adoption of a particular interpretation.

2. In reality, our inquiry into the import of the phrase, *The number of a man*, must be conducted upon a principle very different from the mere wish to escape a fancied difficulty.

(1.) That principle, I take it, must be the parallelism of St. John's own phraseology: and, thus far, I have no right to complain of those who pronounce the phrase to denote the mode of numbering practised among men; for, doubtless, they very justly, in practice, work upon this identical principle.

(2.) Hence the sole question is: Whether they draw a legitimate conclusion from a principle, the abstract justice of which is acknowledged on both sides.

3. It is, as we have just seen, argued: that, since the measure of a man, in the phraseology
of St. John, denotes the mode of measuring practised among men, so the number of a man must denote the mode of numbering practised among men.

(1.) The basis of this comparative argument plainly is: that the phrase, The measure of a man, denotes the mode of measuring practised among men.

Consequently, the whole strength of the argument depends upon the solidity and security of the basis.

(2.) Now I greatly doubt, whether the basis be solid and secure: for I greatly doubt, whether the phrase, The measure of a man, ought, as it is used by St. John, really to be understood as denoting the mode of measuring practised among men.

My own belief is: that the phrase in question respects, not the general mode of measuring practised among men, by feet (for instance), and by cubits, and by furlongs, and by miles; but the special length of one particular measure, borrowed physically from a part of the human body.
The phrase, be it observed, as employed by St. John, immediately follows the mention of cubits\(^1\): and its plain meaning, I think, is; that each such cubit ought to be understood, according to the physical measure of a man's arm from his elbow to the end of his middle finger.

To the furlongs, previously mentioned, the phrase has no respect. It purely regards the cubits: and the sole reason of its introduction is, to define the particular sort of cubit here intended.

The Hebrews used two sorts of cubit: the one, the physical cubit according to the natural measure of a man; the other, an artificial cubit, which was not according to the natural measure of a man, but which exceeded it by a handbreadth.

Of these, the former or natural cubit is specified, as the measure used in measuring the bedstead of the gigantic king of Bashan\(^2\):

\(^1\) He measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel. Rev. xxii. 17.

\(^2\) Only Og, king of Bashan, remained of the remnant of
while the latter or artificial cubit is declared to be the measure used in measuring Ezekiel's mystic third temple.

To prevent, then, a hasty suspicion, that St. John employed the same cubit as Ezekiel (their two visions having a manifest connection with each other), the Apostle first tells us, that his cubit was the measure of a man or the physical cubit; just as Moses tells us, that the bedstead of Og was nine cubits long and four cubits broad, after the cubit of a man: and then, as if to preclude the possibility of misapprehension, he subjoins the words, that is, of the angel; thus intimating, that, since the angel appeared in the form of a man, the physical measure of a man and the giants. Behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron. Is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? Nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man. Deuter. iii. 11.

1 Behold, a wall on the outside of the house round about, and in the man's hand a measuring reed of six cubits long, by the cubit and an handbreadth; so he measured the breadth of the building, one reed; and the height, one reed. Ezek. xl. 5.
physical measure of the angel were, of course, identical.

(3.) Such being the case, our phrase, *The measure of a man*, employed by St. John, denotes, not *the mode of measuring practised among men*, but *that physical mensuration of the human subject which produces the natural as contradistinguished from the artificial cubit.*

(4.) Hence the basis of the argument, which is altogether the mere arbitrary gratuitous assumption that the import of the phrase is *the mode of measuring practised among men*, is shewn to be devoid of all solidity: and hence the argument itself, its basis being destroyed, falls, of plain necessity, to the ground.

In other words, the phrase, *The measure of a man*, affords no inductive proof, that the phrase, *The number of a man*, denotes *the mode of numbering practised among men*.

4. But, though the argument be palpably invalid, the *principle*, upon which it has been constructed, remains quite unimpaired.

Let us, then, see, whether this same prin-
ciple, when legitimately brought into play, will not, with perfect facility lead us to the true meaning of the phrase, *The number of a man*.

(1.) In one and the same continuous passage, we have the two phrases, *The number of a man*, and *The number of the wild-beast*.

*Let him, that hath understanding, count the number of the wild-beast: for it is the number of a man*.

(2.) Here, by every just rule of composition, and strictly on the sound principle now before us, the two phrases, *The number of the wild-beast*, and *The number of a man*, must be understood and interpreted homogeneously.

(3.) But the number of the wild-beast incontrovertibly denotes the number of the name of the wild-beast: for the Apostle himself affords us this interpretation.

(4.) Therefore, analogously, the number of a man can only denote the number of the name of a man.

---

1 Ὅ ἔχον νοῦν ψηφισάτω τον ἀριθμόν τοῦ ὑψίου ἀριθμοῦ γὰρ ἄνθρωπον ἔστιν. Rev. xiii. 18.
5. In truth, the untenability of the gloss, which would make the number of a man to denote the mode of numbering practised among men, will readily appear by merely inverting the terms of comparison.

If the number of a man denotes the mode of numbering practised among men: then, analogously, however absurdly, we are bound to pronounce, that the number of the wild-beast must denote the mode of numbering practised among wild-beasts.

V. It will be found, that this discussion bears strongly upon the main question now before us: for the circumstance of the number of the wild-beast's name being also the number of a man's name, is one of the tests required for the legitimate discovery of the name of blasphemy.
CHAPTER VII.

THE DISCRIMINATING NOTES OF THE APOCALYPTIC NAME OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Though, in so many letters and in so many syllables, St. John has not given us the precise name of the compound symbol under which he exhibits the Roman Empire: yet he has laid down certain notes, which, by their unfailingly concurrent applicability, may securely conduct us to the true name; while, by their want of uniformly concurrent applicability in every other case, they effectually exclude all false pretenders.

As laid down by the inspired Apostle, the discriminating notes are five in number.

Where, with fatal exactness, all these five notes concur in a single proposed name: we may be morally sure, that that name is the
name, which he beheld impressed upon all the seven heads of the hieroglyphic.

But, where, in any proposed name, they fail to concur universally, even though the failure should be no greater than that of one note out of the five: we may be quite sure, that that name cannot be the name alluded to by St. John.

The following are the five notes, which, in such an inquiry, the Apostle has laid down for our guidance.

The name of the wild-beast is the name of blasphemy or the name of apostasy.¹

The name of the wild-beast, impressed upon each of his seven heads as a mark or stigma, is a name descriptive of his character in matters appertaining to religion: and so jealous is he in respect to this particular, that, while he compels all his subjects similarly to receive on their foreheads the mark of his name or (in other words) to adopt the apostatic religious system which for the time being he patronises and upholds, he tyrannically interdicts, from

¹ Rev. xiii. 1. xvii. 3.
buying or selling, every individual, who should refuse to be thus branded or stigmatised.

The number of the wild-beast, or the number inherent in his name of blasphemy, is also the number of some particular man: whence, obviously, since the name is ruled by the number, and since the number of the wild-beast and the number of the man are identical, the religiously descriptive name of the wild-beast and the religiously descriptive name of the man alluded to must be identical also.

The number of the wild-beast is the number of the name of the wild-beast: and that number, when properly calculated, is six hundred and threescore and six.

But the very calculation of the number, even when haply the name of the wild-beast shall have been discovered, is itself a matter of difficulty, and is by no means a process mechanically obvious to any individual: for it requires the exertion of what the Apostle calls Wisdom or Understanding.

---

1 Rev. xiii. 1, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17.  
2 Rev. xiii. 18.  
3 Rev. xiii. 18.  
4 Rev. xiii. 18.
I. Let us begin with observing, whither the first of our five notes will conduct us.

The name of the wild-beast is the name of blasphemy or the name of apostasy.

1. From the very terms of the present note, none, save a name expressive of blasphemy or apostasy, can be the intended name of the wild-beast.

2. Now, in Greek, the language employed by St. John to communicate his vision, either of the two words ΒΔΑΣΦΗΜΟΣ and ΑΠΟΣΤΑΘΣ, in English blasphemer and apostate, will perfectly answer to the requisition of the note: and, beside these two words, no other third suitably expressive word, unless peradventure ΑΡΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ or denier, can be found, I believe, in the whole circle of the greek language.

3. Therefore, at the very commencement of our inquiry, we find ourselves driven to pronounce: that either ΒΔΑΣΦΗΜΟΣ or ΑΠΟΣΤΑΘΣ must be that name of blasphemy which is the name of the wild-beast.

II. Let us, however, examine, whether
these two equipollent names will bear the test involved in our second note.

The name of the wild-beast, impressed upon each of his seven heads, as a mark or stigma, is a name descriptive of his character in matters appertaining to religion: and so jealous is he in respect to this particular, that, while he compels all his subjects similarly to receive on their foreheads the mark of his name or (in other words) to adopt the apostatic religious system which for the time being he patronises and upholds, he tyrannically interdicts, from buying or selling, every individual who should refuse to be thus branded or stigmatised.

With the requisition made in the second note, the two equipollent names BlaspHEmus and Apostates, to which we have been conducted by the necessary tenor of the first note, perfectly and even minutely comply.

1. As the impression of the name of God, even of the Lamb and of the Father upon the foreheads of the 144,000 saints, indicates their devotion to sound religion\(^1\): so either

\(^1\) Rev. xiv. 1.
the name BLASPHEMUS or the name APOSTATÈS, when impressed upon each of the seven heads of the wild-beast, will fully and accurately indicate his character so far as his religious principles are concerned. Whether pagan or papal, mohammedan or infidel, his theology is blasphemous or apostatic. Whence, as his mark or stigma, he himself bears the descriptive name of either BLASPHEMUS or APOSTATÈS.

2. Nor has he been content with only bearing the name of blasphemy himself; under the precise penalty announced in the prediction, he has, whether pagan or papal, laboured diligently to impress it likewise upon all his subjects.

(1.) While Paganism was the fostered apostasy of the Roman Empire, Dioclesian published an edict: that No person should either sell or administer any thing to the Christians, unless they should first have burned incense to the gods 1.

1 Dioclesianus similè edictum edidit, ne quis quidquam
(2.) And, in like manner, while Popery was its cherished apostasy, the third Council of Lateran held at Rome in the year 1179 under Pope Alexander the third, the synod of Tours held in France under the same spiritual tyrant, and the bull of Pope Martin the fifth published after the Council of Constance in the year 1414, all equally enacted: that No one should presume to exercise commerce, in the way of either buying or selling, with those who were denounced as heretics.


III. We will now proceed to the third note laid down by the prophet, as characteristically marking the bestial name of blasphemy.

The number of the wild-beast, or the number inherent in his name of blasphemy, is also the number of some particular man: whence, obviously, since the name is ruled by the number, and since the number of the wild-beast and the


Our own William the Conqueror had already shewn his devotion to the Pope by precisely the same brutish exercise of antichristian tyranny.


It is remarkable, that, in the present disgraceful persecution of Protestantism by the Irish Romanists, the self-same ominous barbarism has again been resorted to: a practice, by which the Popish Priesthood, at once exhibit themselves to be genuine members of the apostate faction, and clearly shew that their ruthless superstition still remains unaltered.
number of the man are identical; the religiously
descriptive name of the wild-beast, and the reli-
giously descriptive name of the man alluded to,
must be identical also.

1. According to the purport of the present
note, if the name BLASPHEMUS or the name
APOSTATE'S be indeed the name of the wild-
beast which St. John beheld inscribed on all
his seven heads: it must also be the descrip-
tive name of some particular man, who has
rendered himself badly eminent and con-
spicuous by his promotion of blasphemy or
apostasy, and who may thence with special
fitness be denominated The Blasphemer or
The Apostate.

(1.) In regard to this particular man, thus
remarkably pointed out, it may be observed:
both that He must be some very eminent
person; and that He must stand in close poli-
tico-theological connection with the wild-beast,
whose number and whose name he thus specially
participates.

(2.) It may be added: that, since he is
thus peculiarly branded as An Apostate in the
midst of a multitude of minor and less influential apostates, we may fairly expect; both that He will be a peculiar subject of scriptural prophecy, and that He will there be reprobated under the precise aspect of an apostate who is the leader of apostates or who is the spiritual head of an apostasy commensurate with the dominions of the wild-beast bearing the descriptive name of Blasphemus or Apostates.

2. Now, to this mingled character, the extraordinary person, who by St. Paul had already been foretold under the appellation of the Man of Sin, perfectly and fully answers.

(1.) That Apostle predicts: that, In the latter times, some shall apostatise from the faith, giving heed to error-teaching spirits and to doctrines concerning demons. And he connets the revelation of the Man of Sin with the coming of a great apostasy: for, in fact, by the revelation of that lawless one as its

1 ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἈΠΟΣΤΗΣΟΝΤΑΙ τινες τῆς πιστίας. 1 Tim. iv. 1.
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ostensible head, the apostasy in question is completed 1.

(2.) The man of sin, therefore, the head and chief promoter of that later blasphemy of the Roman Empire, the papally demonolatrous or saint-worshipping apostasy, is of course himself preëminently the Apostate.

3. Thus, as required by the third note, the name and consequently the inherent number of the wild-beast are the name and number of a man. For St. Paul fixed the descriptive name of the man of sin to be apostatēs; and the name of the wild-beast, as determined by the first note, can only be either apostatēs or blasphēmus.

IV. From the third note, let us next advance to the arithmetical gage propounded in the fourth note.

The number of the wild-beast is the number of the name of the wild-beast: and that number, when properly calculated, is six hundred and threescore and six.

1 Ἕων μὴ Ἕλγῃ ὡς ἈΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΑ πρῶτον. 2 Thess. ii. 3.
1. From the necessity of the apostolical language, which designates the religiously descriptive name of the roman wild-beast as the name of blasphemy, we have been led to the conclusion: that The name, which St. John beheld impressed upon all his seven heads, can only have been either the word BLASPHEMUS or the word APOSTATES.

And accordingly, we have found: that Such an appellation perfectly agrees with the three specified notes, which have been hitherto considered.

2. The fourth note, however, supplied by the Apostle, appears at once to put an extinguisher upon the whole investigation as conducted agreeably to the principles which have been here adopted.

(1.) Whatever may be the precise verbal name of the wild-beast, its letters, when arithmetically computed, produce the exact number 666.

1 Some have fancied, that the number 666 is a period of years: and they suppose, that, by calculating 666 years from the time when the Apocalypse was written, they can attain
(2.) Now the name BLASPHEMUS, when arithmetically calculated, brings out the number 1051: and the name APOSTATēS, when arithmetically calculated, brings out the number 1160.

(3.) Therefore, by the very tenor of the fourth note, it might seem: that Neither BLASPHEMUS nor APOSTATēS can be the name in question.

the true date of the commencement of the tyranny of the wild-beast, and thence of the commencement of the 42 months or the 1260 mystical days to which the continuance of that tyranny is limited.

Others, again, have imagined, that the number 666 is itself nothing else than a date, though a date giving the commencement of the 1200 years. Accordingly, they have discovered, that in the year 666, Pope Vitalian first commanded, that the service of the Church should be performed only in Latin.

How either of these speculations can be made to square with the prophetic definition of the number of the wild-beast, certainly passes my own comprehension.

1 Β, 2; + Δ, 30; + Α, 1; + Σ, 200; + Ψ, 500; + Π, 8; + Μ, 40; + Ο, 70; + Σ, 200; = 1051.

2 Α, 1; + Π, 80; + Ο, 70; + Σ, 200; + Τ, 300; + Α, 1; + Τ, 300; + Η, 8; + Σ, 200; = 1160.
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V. Such, on a hasty glance, appears to be the necessary result from the fourth note: but, if we duly attend to its explanatory successor, we may perhaps find ourselves brought to a different conclusion.

The very calculation of the number, even when haply the name of the wild-beast shall have been discovered, is itself a matter of difficulty, and is by no means a process mechanically obvious to any individual: for it requires the exertion of what the Apostle calls Wisdom or Understanding.

1. It is a remarkable circumstance, though a circumstance most unaccountably overlooked by commentators on the Apocalypse: that St. John makes the exertion of what he calls Wisdom or Understanding, to respect, not the discovery of the name, but the calculation of it when discovered.

1 Dr. More is one of those very few persons, who have noted, that, according to the statement of the Apostle, the wisdom consists, not in the discovery of the name, but in the computation of the number: though I cannot admit the justice of his conclusion from such premises, that Mr. Potter's
Here is Wisdom. Let him, that hath Understanding, calculate the number of the wild-beast. For it is the number of a man: and his number is six hundred and threescore and six

2. Yet, remarkable as such a circumstance is, we may pronounce it to be in truth nothing more than what might have been fairly anticipated. The Apostle himself read the name: and, effectively, he discovered it to the whole world, by declaring it to be the name of principle, to which I have already adverted, must therefore be the true one. The general remark of Dr. More, however is so opposite and so correct, that I subjoin it.

But it seems, there is some skill to be used therein, because he saith: Here is Wisdom; and Let him, that hath Understanding, calculate the number of the beast. Which, if it were but the putting of the numeral letters of some name together, would be but a very petty piece of skill. All the skill or rather luck would be to find out the name; but there will be no skill at all in calculating of the number. But the text saith: Let him, that hath skill, calculate the number of the beast. And it sets down the very number, that is to be numbered. More's Mystery of Godliness, book v. chap. 16, § 8. Works, p. 134.

1 Rev. xiii. 18.
blasphemy or apostasy. Hence, for whatever reason, while he lays no stress upon the discovery, as if that were a matter already accomplished: he distinctly intimates, that, in the calculation of the name, there was great difficulty; so that, in his apprehension, it would require a considerable measure of wisdom or understanding.

This, accordingly, we find to be the case.

(1.) That either blasphemy or apostates is the name in question, we feel morally certain from the declarative phraseology of St. John: and yet, if we arithmetically compute the respective letters of these two words, we find, perhaps with some sensation of disappointment, that neither of them will bring out the specified number.

(2.) Now why, in the management of each word alike, do we equally fail in producing the desired result?

Clearly, because we have not fulfilled the terms so distinctly laid down by the Apostle. He demands wisdom at our hands: and we
have fallen to work in a manner purely mechanical.

(3.) For let us consider, how the matter really stands at the present stage of the discussion.

In computing the component letters of the two words BLASPHEMUS and APOSTATES, so as to bring out the two unsatisfactory numerical results 1051 and 1160, it is obvious: that no wisdom or understanding has in any wise been displayed. The whole process, in each case, has been purely mechanical: so purely mechanical, indeed, that a mere school-boy, acquainted with the arithmetical powers of the greek letters, might, with the utmost facility and without the least exertion of intellect, have made precisely the same calculations. Hence, even if the letters of one of these two words had thus mechanically brought out the exact sum of 666; that circumstance, though an apparent confirmation, would only have been a real impediment: because, on such a supposition, the distinct statement of the prophecy, that Wisdom or Understanding would
be requisite to calculate the number comprehended in the name, would not have been fulfilled.

(4.) Yet, though, when calculated mechanically or without wisdom, neither BLASPHEMUS nor APPOSTATES will give the specified number 666: it does not therefore follow, that one of the two names is incapable of producing that number, when calculated unmechanically or with wisdom.

3. The matter now before us will lead to an inquiry, not a little curious in itself, and

1 I apprehend, that this single circumstance alone effectually shuts out all those names, which are usually produced as the supposed name of the wild-beast. Each, by its fa-vouerer, is asserted to be the name in question: and, in proof of the allegation, its numerical letters, when summed up, are stated to bring out the exact amount of 666. But this summing up is purely a mechanical operation, which requires neither wisdom nor understanding: whereas, according to the terms of the prophecy, wisdom or understanding is essentially necessary toward the right conducting of the process. Therefore no name, the letters of which by mere mechanical computation bring out the number 666, can possibly be the intended name of the wild-beast.
likewise (if I mistake not) in point of its result altogether satisfactory.

(1.) St. John saw and read the name of the wild-beast, as impressed upon all his seven heads: and thence, from his own ocular inspection, he pronounced it to be the name of blasphemy or the name of apostasy.

When he had read it, and when he had been told that the number contained in it is 666; he naturally attempted the computation of its letters: but he found, that, by no mode of reckoning with which he was acquainted, could he bring out the specified number.

Hence he reasonably pronounced the calculation of the number to require wisdom: and hence, in a sort of despair (if I may so speak), he exclaimed; Let him, that hath understanding, calculate the number of the wild-beast.

(2.) However the fact is to be accounted for, he himself did not possess the true principle of computation.

He believed and he recorded, that the name of blasphemy, which he beheld, would, when
rightly calculated, produce the precise sum of 666: and he so believed, because he had been so assured.

But that sum he himself could not bring out of the name: and, therefore, he referred its then sealed up calculation to a future age, when, by some discovery of a true principle, or by some change in the then prevalent mode of reckoning, the necessary measure of wisdom or understanding should be communicated.

In all this, there is nothing but what well accords with the systematically gradual development of prophecy, as its roll is by the hand of time slowly and regularly unfolded.

(3.) Since the name of blasphemy itself, like the whole comprehending book of the Apocalypse, was expressed in the Greek language; the character, in which the Apostle beheld the name of blasphemy impressed upon the heads of the wild-beast, must obviously have been the Greek character: and, that he beheld it thus impressed in the uncial or capital Greek letters, and not in the cursive or
small Greek letters, seems, on the whole to be morally certain.

Doubtless, indeed, the inscription in the Greek cursive character, even with the accompanying accents and spirits, discovered in the year 1743 at Resina on a wall which forms the angle of a street leading to the theatre, plainly intimates: that That character had been invented, at least in very many of its letters, prior to the destruction of Herculaneum in the year 79, and therefore prior to the reign of Domitian in which St. John is generally admitted to have written the Apocalypse.

But, since both the oldest manuscripts of

1 It has always appeared to me strangely incongruous to seek the name of blasphemy in any other language and character than the Greek. If this view of the matter be just, various names in Hebrew and in Latin, which have severally been adduced as the apocalyptic name of the wild-beast, must, from the very circumstance of their being Hebrew and Latin (even were they unobjectionable in other respects), be thrown aside as inherently untenable. Such is the somewhat favourite Hebrew name Romith: and such are the very commonly adduced titles Vicarius Filii Dei and Vicarius Dei Generalis in Terris.
the New Testament now extant, and also the
greek papyri found at Herculaneum, are
written in uncial letters; apparently on the
principle, that *The uncialis were used in grand
public works and were employed by those who
wrote with a view to beauty and permanence*:
the presumption is, that the Apostle beheld
and read the name of blasphemy, impressed as
the mark or stigma of the wild-beast, in the
uncial, not in the cursive, letters.

1 Qui et Apocalypsin viderat. Neque enim ante multum
temporis visum est, sed pæne sub nostro seculo, ad finem

1. For his kindness in extracting and communicating the
subsequent information, I am indebted to my valued friend
the Rev. L. V. Harcourt.

1. On the sixth of March, 1743, at Resina, on a wall
which formed the angle of a street leading to the theatre,
was found, written in black and red letters, ὡς ἐν σοφὸν
βούλευμα τὰς πολλὰς χείρας νικᾷ. It is written in the
cursive character: and has the accents and spirits marked.
Pitt. Antiche di Ercolano. vol. ii. p. 34.

2. Or di quel peso sia questa inscrizione, la di cui anti-
chita è incontrastabile, per terminar la questione sull' epoca
delli accenti che da pochi si è sospettato essersi a tempo di
Cicerone usati e da tutti gli altri comunemente si son finora
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Hence, if we suppose the name of the wild-beast to be *apostatis* (for, by no mode of

credutì introdotti verso il settimo secolo, et dalla forma de' caratteri greci minuscoli, non vi è chi nol vegga. Montfauc. Ant. vol. ii. p. 34.

3. *This inscription*, says Scholz, *as containing a moral maxim, was exposed to public observation.*

This, surely, supposes a character in use and known to all. How, then, does it happen, that, among the greek inscriptions of the ages, before Titus and after, which have been published, no inscription until the sixth century should ever have been seen written in that character or with the marks of accents? Are we to say, that this character was lost just after the time of Titus, and reappeared in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries when we see it in the manuscripts of that age? Sir W. Drummond's *Herculanens. dissert. viii.*

II. Of this difficulty, naturally enough propounded by Sir W. Drummond, I have given, in the text, what I believe to be the true solution.

*The cursive character was originally employed, only in familiar intercourse, or in matters (like the Restina inscription) analogous to familiar intercourse: while, in grave public inscriptions of a commemorative nature and in the manuscripts of Works destined for perpetuity, the uncial character was systematically preferred.*

Of the latter, many have come down to us: of the former,
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calculation, can the fated number be elicited
from the parallel word blasphemus): that
word apostate's would have been presented
to the eyes of St. John in the uncial form of
Apollostathc.

To the present question, however, it mat-
ters not, whether he read the name uncially ex-
pressed Apollostathc, or cursorily ex-
pressed Æostathc: for, in either case, on the
supposition that the name is really apostate's,
it is clear, that, by no possibility, could the pro-
phet have extracted the number 666 out of a
name thus expressed: yet, on such a supposi-
tion, it is equally clear, that, by some mode of
computation, the name was positively de-
clared to be capable of producing that precise
number.

(4.) Here, then, lies the enigma: and, in

none (appertaining to that very early age) save the Resina
inscription.

Gradually, however, the greater convenience of the cur-
sive character was so clearly felt and allowed, that, at length,
it was employed in regular manuscripts of Works as well as
in the familiarity of private correspondence.
the days of St. John, that enigma was incapable of solution; because it depended upon a peculiar mode of abbreviated writing, which at that time had not been invented, and which consequently at that time could not have been employed.

The inconvenience, attendant upon the transcription of whole volumes in the uncial greek character, led to the gradual invention and to the ultimate general use of the cursive greek character. Accordingly, as this latter character had been contrived anterior to the writing of the Apocalypse: so some forms of it, as the α and the λ and the χ and the ϋ, appear, intermingled with the uncial letters, in the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament. But, apparently on the principle laid down above, no manuscripts, older than the tenth century, occur, which are regularly and uniformly expressed in the cursive character: and it may specially be noted, that the particular cursive form ζ is not found in any manuscripts earlier than the thirteenth century.
Yet, even in the cursive character, though a manifest graphical improvement upon the tardy and inflexible uncial, the writing of Greek, from the necessity of taking the pen off the paper in the formation of each separate letter, is still sufficiently wearisome. Hence, to remedy this inconvenience, an additional attempt was made to increase the cursiveness of the cursive character by an approximation, though a very imperfect approximation, to what we familiarly denominate running-hand. The attempt in question led to the invention of those complex or compound forms, which by a single uninterrupted motion of the pen, severally expresses two or more letters: and, beyond this, the greek language, as a written character, has never, I believe, proceeded.

Now, in the construction of these compendia or (as they are usually styled) contractions, the compendium ς was framed out of the two distinct cursive letters ζ and τ: and, since (as I have stated above) the cursive form ζ does not occur in any manuscripts older than
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the thirteenth century, the compendium τ, into which the cursive form ẓ enters, is found, as might naturally be anticipated, in no manuscripts older than the thirteenth or fourteenth century.

Such was the origin and antiquity of the compendium τ, as employed to represent the two cursive letters ẓ and τ.

But, by a very curious accidental or rather unintentional coincidence, the compendium, thus produced, exactly corresponded, in point of form, with the notation, finally employed to designate arithmetically the number six, and itself apparently derived from the figure, as it occupies the place, of the now obsolete Vau or Digamma¹.

¹ For the substance of these remarks on the uncial and cursive characters of the greek language, I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Blomfield, the present very learned Bishop of London. It may be useful and proper to subjoin his own statement in his own precise words.

I look upon it as certain: that, whether the litera minuscule had been invented before the christian era or not, the books of the New Testament were written, by their authors or by the amanuenses of their authors, not in cursive, but in
4. From this gradual combination of circumstances, which were in a course of occurrence, uncial, characters; for the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament now extant are written in uncial letters, and so are the Greek papyri found at Herculaneum. No manuscripts older than the tenth century, are written in the cursive character; that is to say, in what we commonly call the cursive character: for the uncial character, in which the oldest manuscripts of the New Testament are written, has some forms of the cursive, as the \( \alpha, \lambda, \chi, \) and \( \omega \); but not the form \( \zeta \), which is not found in any manuscript earlier than the thirteenth century. Bast. Comm. Palæogr. p. 738: The compendium \( \tau \) was formed of this modern form of the final \( \xi \): and, I believe, occurs in no manuscript older than the thirteenth or fourteenth century.

I. I have said: that the notation \( \tau \) was finally employed arithmetically to designate the number six.

The word finally I use, because various modifications of the same general form, all borrowed in cursive hand from the sixth letter of the original Greek alphabet, namely the \( \upsilon \) or Digamma \( \digamma \), had been previously employed for this arithmetical purpose. One of these forms, that which seems to have immediately preceded and introduced the modern or present \( \tau \), was, as the Bishop of London states, \( \zeta \).

II. The ultimate graphical coincidence of the arithmetical \( \tau \) and the literal \( \tau \), in point of actual form, is deserving of special notice; inasmuch as, though perfectly identical in shape, they sprang from two entirely different origins. For
rence during the lapse of the middle ages, the result so far as our present investigation is concerned, will prove not a little remarkable.

(1.) Whether the word ἀποστάτης be written in the uncial character ἈΠΟΣΤΑΤΗϹ, as that character was employed for permanent manuscripts and for grave commemorative public inscriptions; or whether it be written in the cursive character ἀποστάτης, as that character, after its invention, was originally used for writings of a more familiar description: in either case, if, disregarding the apostolic intimation that the number cannot be counted without wisdom, we persist in a mere mechanical computation; we shall

the arithmetical τ has no concern with the letters γ and ι; but, standing as it does in the sixth place of the numerical greek alphabet, it is evidently nothing else than the cursive form of the original sixth greek letter Ε: while the literal τ has no concern with the original sixth greek letter Ε, but is undoubtedly a compendium or contraction produced by the cursive junction of the two cursive forms γ and ι.

Yet, by this ultimate graphical coincidence, the arithmetical τ and the literal τ will be found to solve the numerical enigma of the Apocalypse.
find, that the component letters, being throughout, according to both modes of writing, equal in respect to arithmetical value, will alike produce, not the number 666, but the number 1160¹.

¹ I put the alternative of uncial or cursive, because it matters not to my purpose, in which of the two characters St. John beheld the name inscribed. But, that he really beheld it in the uncial character, there can, I think, be very little doubt. For such an opinion, the practice of all antiquity is an amply sufficient voucher.

On the supposition that Apostate was really the inscribed name of blasphemy, There can be no doubt, says the Bishop of London, of St. John having written APOCATHC. In that uncial form, and in no other, the Apostle must have beheld it. He saw it, I apprehend, branded, as the mark of the wild-beast, upon all his seven heads. For the name, as some have erroneously fancied, is not one thing, while the mark is quite another thing. On the contrary, the mark is nothing else, than the brand or impress or stamp of the name. Character bestic, as Mede well remarks, non est propriè nisi nominis. Med. Comment. Apoc. in loc. Oper. p. 509. This view of the matter is fully established by the best and most approved reading of the original. Τὸ χαραγμα, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου: The mark, the name of the wild-beast. Thus reads Griesbach, omitting, as an interpolation, the vulgar intermediate η, or. The mark, I repeat it, was not
(2.) Yet, if the same word *apostātēs* be written after a mode unknown when St. John flourished; that is to say, if the same word *apostates* be written in the cursive character with the introduction of the compendium ς to express by one notation the two consecutive letters σ and τ: it will then, in its present familiar form of ἀποστάτης, bring out the precise number 666.

5. Thus, I take it, the requisition of the fifth note, viewed as explanatory of the fourth note, will be fully answered.

(1.) Reading the name of the wild-beast, as inscribed upon all his seven heads in the uncial form of ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΗΣ; learning that the name, when properly computed, would produce the number 666; and finding, upon trial, that, by no mode of computation with which *he* was acquainted, would the name bring out the fated number: the Apostle

something *distinct* from the name, but only its *brand* or *impression.*

\[ \alpha, 1; + \pi, 80; + \omicron, 70; + \tau, 6; + \alpha, 1; + \tau, 300; + \eta, 8; + \upsilon, 200: = 666. \]
make the experiment, simply as an experiment: and I found, that the required number 666 was the exact product.

Still I could not recollect, where I had seen the word APOSTATE brought forward as the name of the wild-beast: and the consequence was, that I was compelled to publish my Sacred Calendar of Prophecy without making an acknowledgment.

Some time after the publication of that Work, happening to be on a visit to my friend Mr. Vernon Harcourt, what I had vainly endeavoured to recover I found, where I had little expected to find it, in a volume of the Works of Archdeacon Wrangham. The Archdeacon being then accidentally, with myself, a visitor in the same house, I, of course, immediately stated to him the preceding circumstances: and I gladly take this second opportunity (I have already made a first opportunity), of giving them to the Public.

Certain further remarks, upon the adoption of the word APOSTATE and upon the antiquity of the rational of its adoption, will be given below, chap. ix.
CHAPTER VIII.

RECAPITULATION OF, AND REMARKS UPON, THE FIVE DISCRIMINATING NOTES.

It may be useful, in conclusion, to recapitulate, and to offer some few remarks upon, the five discriminating notes.

I. We have now seen, that the name APOSTATES fully answers to the joint requisitions of the fourth and fifth notes laid down by St. John, as it had previously answered to the several requisitions of the first and second and third notes. The summary, therefore, of the correspondence, will stand as follows.

1. The name APOSTATES, according to the requisition of the first note, is a name of blasphemy or apostasy.

2. The name APOSTATES, according to the requisition of the second note, is a name de-
scriptive of the wild beast's character in matters appertaining to religion: which name, as expressive of a principle, he has sought, under the penalty of an interdict from buying and selling, violently to impose upon all his subjects.

3. The name APOSTATE$^{3}$, according to the requisition of the third note, is the name, still viewed as expressing a principle, of an eminently conspicuous man, announced in prophecy under the precise aspect of connection with an apostasy.

4. The name APOSTATE$^{3}$, according to the requisition of the fourth note, is a name, which, in its arithmetical letters, comprehends the exact prescribed number 666.

5. But the name APOSTATE$^{3}$, according to the requisition of the fifth note, is a name, which comprehends that fatal number, only when calculated with what St. John calls wisdom or understanding.

II. This quintuple coincidence seems to demonstrate, with at least an approximation to mathematical certainty, that APOSTATE$^{3}$ and
apostates alone, is that name of blasphemy, which is the theologically descriptive name of the Roman Empire.

1. Without any impeachment of the value of the test, it is no difficult matter to conceive: that, with any single note out of those five notes which are propounded by St. John, various different names may be found to correspond.

But, when all the five notes are combined, so as to form one joint and concurring test: in that case, even to say nothing of what is called the law of chances, a test so constructed would plainly lose all its efficacy as a test, if more than some one single specific name might be subjected to it with a satisfactory result.

2. Accordingly, in Greek and in Latin and in Hebrew, various names or titles have been discovered or contrived, all of which, with tolerable handsomeness, agree in producing the required number 666.

But let any one of the names, adduced on the mere insulated arithmetical principle, be brought to the five-fold test laid down by the
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Apostle: and its glaring defectiveness will immediately appear. With the arithmetical note however imperfectly, and perhaps yet additionally with this or with that other note, such a name may be found to correspond: but, with all the five notes, conjointly used as one test, it does not correspond. Either here, or there, we invariably detect a failure 1.

1 Thus, to exemplify what I mean, the name Δάφνος, if its orthography can be tolerated, will correspond with the fourth note, but not with the first and second and third and fifth.

Thus the title Ἡ Δαφνη Βασιλεία, which has been contrived with an eye to correct orthography, will correspond with the fourth note, but with none of the other notes.

Thus the name Μαθερίς, if we pass over the gross mistake, involved in its very adoption, through which the proprietorship of the name is ascribed to the second apocalyptic wild-beast instead of the first, may correspond with the third and fourth notes, but does not correspond with the first and second and fifth.

Thus the name ῥομίῳ corresponds with the fourth note, but with none of the others.

Thus the titles Vicarius Filii Dei and Vicarius Dei generalis in terris correspond severally with the fourth note, and may perhaps be said yet additionally to correspond with the
3. Now, with the sole exception of the name \textit{apostates}, this remark, so far as I am aware, is of universal application.

Hence I argue: that, since no other name hitherto discovered fulfils the requisition of our quintuple test, and since the name \textit{apostates} most minutely \textit{does} fulfil it; every other name must be rejected as unsatisfactory, while the name \textit{apostates} must be received as being indeed that name of blasphemy which St. John beheld inscribed on all the seven heads of the great bestial roman hieroglyphic.

\textit{first and third notes:} but certainly they do not correspond with the second or fifth.

If the same comparative process be adopted in regard to any other name or title that has been excogitated, the result, with the sole exception of the word \textit{\'Apov\v{a}n\v{e}s}, will, I believe, \textit{always} prove alike unsatisfactory.
CHAPTER IX.

THE ADOPTION OF THE NAME APPOSTATES AS THE
APOCALYPTIC NAME OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE,
AND THE ANTIQUITY OF THE TRUE RATIONALE
OF ITS ADOPTION.

It will be alike just and useful to give some account, both of the adoption of the name Apostates as the apocalyptic name of the Roman Empire, and also of the antiquity of the true rational of its adoption.

I. So far as I know, the first person, who had the merit of striking out the name Apostates as the enigmatical name of the wild-beast, was Archdeacon Wrangham.

Justly pronouncing, from the very terms of the prophecy, that The name in question is the name of blasphemy; and no less justly laying down, that Blasphemy is a term employed to denote
THE APOCALYPTIC NAME, &c. 103

Apostasy: he was led, simply as a matter of curiosity and with no sanguine anticipation of the result, to compute the arithmetical value of the personally applicable word ἀποσάρηç; and he found it to be exactly 666.1

1. Nothing can be more rational and satisfactory than the principle of my learned and ingenious friend, so far as it goes. But, in point of amount, I conceive it to be defective.

(1.) He builds upon no more than two, or at the most three, of the specified prophetic notes: whereas, in truth, there are five.

(2.) He tacitly assumes, that St. John beheld the word written in the precise form and character ἀποσάρηç: whereas, at the time when the Apostle lived, such a circumstance was impossible.

(3.) And he seems to limit the idea of the wild-beast's blasphemy to the single idolatrous apostasy of Popery: whereas the name of blasphemy was imprinted upon all the seven

heads of the roman symbol, as they successively existed from the time of Romulus down to the time of Napoleon.

2. Much, therefore, yet remained to be done through a combination of fixed principles; much also yet remained to be done, in the way of removing certain very obvious graphical difficulties: before the Archdeacon's felicitous discovery could be adopted with a feeling of perfect security.

These matters I have endeavoured to supply: and I trust, that the attempt has been made not altogether unsuccessfully.

II. The key to the whole investigation, or the true rationalë on which the name apostatës ought to be adopted as the concealed apocalyptic name of the Roman Empire, is the circumstance: that The name of the wild-beast is the name of blasphemy or the name of apostasy, branded conspicuously, as his special mark, upon all his seven successive heads.

1. It is a curious circumstance, that this true key Irenèus, in the second century, appears certainly to have possessed: but, for
the reasons which have now been amply stated, he, like a greater than himself, even his master's master St. John, was inevitably precluded from using it.

(1.) In strict accordance with the terms of the prophecy, Irenèus viewed the blasphemous wild-beast, as a compendium or summary or recapitulation of even Omnipotens Apostasy: and he has intimated pretty plainly, that, to this Omnipotens Apostasy, his numerical appellation had a special respect.

But, in the stubborn words of the uncial ἈΠΟΣΤΑΤΗϹ, the key, though the true key, refused to turn: and, with the compendium or contraction ς, the name of blasphemy could not then have been written ¹.

¹ Et characterem, aut in fronte aut in manu dextra, faciet dari; ne possit aliquid esse vel vendere, nisi qui habet characterem nominis bestiae vel numerum nominis ejus, et esse numerum 666; in recapitulationem universæ apostasiae ejus, quæ facta est in sex millibus annorum. Iren. adv. haer. lib. v. c. 23.

Propter hoc, in bestia veniente, recapitulatio est universæ iniquitatis et omnis doli, ut in ea confluentes et conclusa omnis virtus apostatica in caminum mittatur ignis.
This ancient Father's estimate of the universality of the wild-beast's apostasy is strictly correct. The name of blasphemy is written upon all the heads of the symbol, under many of which the Roman Empire was exclusively pagan, and under some of which it was, either generally or particularly, papal or mo-hammedan or infidel. Consequently, it is an error to restrict so comprehensive a name to the later or demonolatrously christian Roman Empire.

(2.) Irenæus not only thus accurately lays down the leading principle of solution, but he even introduces the very name ἈΠΟΣΤΑ-ΘΗΣ, as the appropriate designation of that

man whom St. Paul denominates *The Man of Sin*.

(3.) On the whole, from the marked peculiarity of his entire phraseology, I strongly suspect: that Irenéus *himself* arithmetically calculated the word ἈΠΟΣΤΑΘΗϹ, written, as it doubtless was *then* written in uncial characters and *without* the compendium τ. Finding, however, that, instead of producing the required number 666, it produced the much larger number 1160, he was thence compelled to abandon the actual word ἈΠΟΣΤΑΘΗϹ, as being the *precise name* of the wild-beast: for, circumstanced as he viewed it, the word ἈΠΟΣΤΑΘΗϹ was doubtless arithmetically inadmissible.

---

1 Non tantum per ea quae dicta sunt, sed et per ea quae erunt sub Antichristo, ostenditur; quoniam, existens *Apostata* (doubtless, in the original Greek of Irenæus, ἈΠΟΣΤΑΘΗϹ) et latro, quasi Deus vult adorari.—Sine lege quasi *Apostata* (Græc. ἈΠΟΣΤΑΘΗϹ), diabolicam apostasiam in se recapitulans, et idola quidem seponens. Iren. adv. hær. lib. v. c. 21.

2 Although the form τ, as a compendium of the two letters ζ and τ, was unknown in the time of Irenæus; the
But still, with much sound judgment, while he abandoned the word, he did not relinquish the principle.

Accordingly, after suggesting, first the word EYAN, which, nevertheless, contains not the requisite number, and next the word ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟC, on the acknowledged insufficient ground that it might express the then regnant Latin Empire: he hastens to

same form τ, as a numeral representing six, or, at least something similar to it, was certainly used in his time.

What may be the precise antiquity of the numeral τ, or as it is called, with reference to its cursive origination from Vau or Digamma Φ the sixth letter of the old Greek Alphabet, the ἐπισήμων βαῦ, I know not: but at all events, it existed when Irenæus wrote.

He tells us, that the letter H, which now stands the seventh letter in the Greek Alphabet, stood the eighth, when the Episemon, as occupying the sixth place and as representing the number six, was taken into the account.

Therefore, evidently the form τ, or, at least, some cognate form approximating to it, was used, as a numeral representing six, in the time of Irenæus.

Τὸ γὰρ στοιχεῖον τὸ Η, σῶν μὲν τῷ ἐπισήμῳ, ὡδόδδα εἶναι θέλουσιν, ἀπό τοῦ πρώτου, ἡγέον κείμενον τόπου. Iren. adv. hær. lib. i. c. 13.
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propose, what he deems the far preferable word TEITAN, on the principle that It was a generic name of idols adored both among the Greeks and among the Barbarians; that is to say, he proposes the word TEITAN, on the principle that It was the name of blasphemy or idolatrous apostasy.

1 Certius ergo et sine periculo est sustinere ad imple- tionem propheticæ, quam suspicari et divinare nomina quælibet; quando multa nomina inveniri possunt, habentia prædictum numerum. Et nihilominus quidem erit hæc eadem quæstio. Si enim multa sunt quæ inveniuntur nomina habentia numerum hunc, quod ex ipsis portabit qui veniet, quaeritur.

Quoniam autem non propter inopiam nominum haben- tium numerum nominis ejus dicimus hæc, sed propter timo- rem erga Deum et zelum veritatis.

EYAN enim nomen habet numerum, de quo quaeritur: sed nihil de eo affirmamus.

Sed et AATEINOC nomen, 666 numerum; et valdè verisimile est, quoniam verissimum regnum hoc habet voca- bulum, Latinì enim sunt qui nunc regnant: sed non in hoc nos gloriamur.

Sed et TEITAN, prima syllaba per duas græcas vocales E et I scripta, omnium nominum, quæ apud nos inveniuntur, magis fide dignum est. Etenim prædictum numerum habet in se; et literarum etiam sex, singulis syllabis ex ternis literis constantibus: et vetus et semotum, neque eorum
Now Titan was, indeed, a generic name of all the gods descended from Cronus or Saturn: but, unluckily, neither Titan nor Latinus ever occur written with the diphthong EI; a mode of spelling, essentially necessary to their respective production of the number 666. The Greeks always wrote them TITAN and ΛΑΤΙΝΟΣ. Still, in the case of the finally preferred word Titan, Irenèus, we see, works upon the true principle: the principle, to wit, that The name of the wild-beast is the name regum, qui secundum nos sunt, aliquis vocatus est Titan. Namque eorum quæ publicè adorantur idolorum apud Graecos et Barbaros habet vocabulum: et divinum putatur apud multos esse hoc nomen, ut etiam sol Titan vocetur ab his qui nunc tenent: et ostentationem quandam continent ulptionis et vindictam inferentis, quod ille simulat se malè tractatos vindicare. Tale autem, et antiquum, et fide dignum, et regale, magis autem et tyrannicum, nomen. Cum igitur tantum suasionis habeat hoc nomen TEITAN, tamen habet verisimilitudinem, ut ex multis colligamus, ne forte Titan vocetur qui veniet: nos tamen non periclitabimur in eo, nec asseverantes pronuntiabimus hoc eum nomen habiturum: scientes, quoniam, si oporteret manifeste praetenti tempore praecori nomen ejus, per eum utique editum fuisse, qui et Apocalypsin viderat. Iren. adv. hær. lib. v. c. 25.
of blasphemy or apostasy. Whence I am led to suspect, that he had calculated the uncial and uncontracted word ἈΠΟΣΤΑΤΗΣ, and that of course he had been disappointed in the result.

2. In conclusion, it may not be uninteresting to add: that some notion of the true character of that grand seducer, whose name and number were to be identical with the name and number of the secular Roman Empire, has been entertained even by a popish expositor; and that, still by a popish expositor, an attempt, upon the precise principle here contended for, has actually been made, though with imperfect success, to specify the name and to calculate the number of the wild-beast.

(1.) The man of sin, and the second wild-beast of the Apocalypse, are, as all agree in the abstract, substantially one and the same character: which character is also stigmatised by St. John with the appellation of The False Prophet.

Now Acosta, supposing, in respect to
poetical machinery, that the two horns of the second or ecclesiastical wild-beast may exhibit a sort of picture of the mitre, just as the scarlet colour and the scarlet robes of the first wild-beast and his harlot rider refer to the imperial purple, thence concludes: that *The false prophet will be some bishop who is an apostate and a simulator of religion*.

Such an exposition is not a little remarkable, as proceeding from a popish interpreter.

Acosta, we see, fully admits the *basis* of the usual protestant explanation of the prophecy respecting the second wild-beast of the Apocalypse: and thence, I may add, virtually admits the propriety of deeming *The Man of Sin*, who is to sit in the temple of God, an *Apostate Bishop of the Christian Church*.

The question, therefore, between Pa-

---

pists and Protestants, is now, by the concession of Acosta, narrowed to the inquiry: what Apostate Bishop can be intended by the voice of Prophecy?

(2.) Various names are specified by Calmet, as all equally containing the number 666, and therefore as all equally capable of being plausibly received for the name of the wild-beast.¹

¹ See Calmet's Diction. in voc. Antichrist. Calmet, with the generally provident acuteness of a Romish Priest, strives to discourage all inquiry by a sort of reductio ad absurdum. He tells us, that even the holy name of God, ELION ADONAI JEHOVAH KADOSH, when written and calculated in hebrew letters, will actually produce the number 666. This last name, says he, could have been invented only to shew the vanity of all the pains taken in this inquiry: since the number 666 is found in names the most sacred, the most opposite to Antichrist. The wisest and the safest way is, to be silent.

Calmet’s recommendation of silence might have been both wise and safe, had St. John given us no other note, by which the name of the wild-beast might be ascertained, except that, when arithmetically calculated, it should produce the number 666: and it is impossible not to observe, that the whole force of the recommendation depends upon the virtual
Among them occurs one name, which has evidently been excogitated upon the only principle that can be deemed legitimate: the principle, I mean, that *The name of the wild-beast must be, as St. John himself teaches us, the name of blasphemy or apostasy.*

The contriver of that name clearly perceived, as Irenèus had perceived before him: that *No name can be the name in question, unless it express an apostasy from, or a denial of, sound religion.*

assumption or the tacit insinuation, that such is actually the case.

Doubtless, if we could only determine the name by the single circumstance of its producing the number 666, it were indeed the wisest and the safest to be silent. But the divine oracle is not disgraced by the vague absurdity of a single note. *St. John lays down no less than five notes, one only of which is, the production of the number 666, for the purpose of enabling us rationally and satisfactorily to ascertain the real name of the wild-beast.*

Why Calmet should be anxious to shut up all inquiry, is obvious enough: but his mode of proceeding can weigh only with readers of the most superficial description.
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Under the influence of this very just sentiment, he forthwith took the greek participle ἈΡΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ, which signifies A Denier: evidently, and reasonably enough, borrowing the appellation from St. John’s own avowed description of the Antichrist¹.

But, upon computing its arithmetical letters, he soon found, even upon a mere mechanical calculation, that the word ἈΡΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ, instead of producing the number 666, produced the number 986.

What, then, was to be done in this emergency?

The word was, in itself, too plausible to be lightly given up: and, as the expository bed of Procrustes, in one of its operations, had mercilessly elongated TITAN and ΔΑΤΙΝΟΣ; so, in another of its operations, it might be employed, no less mercilessly, to

¹ Τίς ἦσσιν ὁ ἴσαβλης, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἈΡΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός; Οὔτος ἦσσιν ὁ Ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἈΡΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ τῶν πατέρων καὶ τῶν νεόν. Πᾶς ὁ ἈΡΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ τῶν νεόν, εὐθεῖα τῶν πατέρων ἦκεν ὁ ἰμμολογῶν τῶν νεόν, καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἦκεν. 1 John ii. 22, 23.
sheer away a whole limb from APNOYME-NOΣ.

After a manner sufficiently arbitrary, our speculatist, boldly no doubt, but perhaps not with the wisdom or understanding alluded to by the Apostle, lopped off bodily the whole last syllable of the word: and then, in the mutilated form APNOYME, he readily found the required number 666.

Calmet does not give the name of the individual, who struck out this exposition: and I am unable to supply the deficiency. I mention his gloss, not of course as being satisfactory, but as shewing the recognition of the true principle or rationalé.

That principle, as we have seen, is no modern fancy: on the contrary, it has been far too much neglected and overlooked by modern commentators. Hence we have been saturated with a bootless coinage of fancied names or titles loose or indefinite or inapplicable: which are recommended by little more, than the circumstance of their numerical letters severally producing the fatal sum of 666.
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The *rationale*, for which I contend, is as old as the time of Irenæus: and Archdeacon Wrangham shewed, at once, his judicious sobriety in adopting it, and his felicitous ingenuity in striking out the true name under its safe and satisfactory guidance.
CHAPTER X.

GENERAL CONCLUSION.

The moral, to be deduced from the whole inquiry, is sufficiently evident.

I. Those persons, who fix their hope of salvation upon the efficacy of the first advent of the Messiah, and who look forward to that second advent of the same divine Redeemer when he shall come again in his glorious majesty to judge both the quick and the dead, are solemnly warned against the danger and the offensiveness of all apostasy from the soundness and simplicity of God’s own revelation.

In these latter perilous times, such a warning is eminently appropriate.

At different periods of its existence, and under some one or other of its seven heads or polities, the Roman Empire, in strict accord-
ance with its prophetically branded hieroglyphic, has been distinguished by the four apostasies of Paganism and Popery and Mohammedism and Infidelity.

From the occidentally extinct apostasy of Paganism, and from the universally declining apostasy of Mohammedism, there may be little danger in countries which have once been christianised: but the case is very different with respect to the two apostasies of Popery and Infidelity.

The advocates of each of those schemes are abundantly active: and, however widely they differ in other respects, they concur in reviling the pure Christianity of the Gospel, either under the aspect of its being a damnable heresy, or under the aspect of its being altogether a palpable imposture.

II. In truth, we live during a period, when all the foundations of the earth may well be said to be out of course.

I. Even the most careless observer cannot refrain from noticing and acknowledging the existence of a general fermentation, certainly
throughout all Europe, perhaps indeed well nigh throughout the whole world.

A feverish spirit of change purely for the sake of change, and a childish desire to pull down old institutions merely because they are old, united with a splendid contempt of our more sober forefathers and with a ludicrously overweening estimate of our own prodigious wisdom (if, verily, a decent man could be tempted to smile, when he is more rationally inclined to weep at such apish folly), are the leading operative characteristics of the present age.

In former times, the dawning of such a spirit were, at least, marked by a strong sense of religious obligation. But, in its maturity, this spirit seems portentously determined, so far as unhallowed wishes can prevail, to shut God out of his own world, to refuse all recognition of his sovereign interference, and gracelessly to scoff at the very idea of a nationally and individually superintending Providence.

2. When the spirit of innovating Anarchy
is thus distinguished by its close alliance with the blasphemous spirit of Infidelity, and when by his ominous junction with such associates the Roman Man of Sin once more vindicates to himself the accurate prophetic description of the Lawless One: we cannot but suspect, that matters are in a state of rapid preparation for that final tremendous overthrow of God's enemies which is the theme of so many inspired vaticinations.

The very politician of this world, purely in the way of cause and effect, anticipates a wide-wasting war of principles and a series of political convulsions upon a scale of appalling magnitude: and, with his anticipations, the devout student of prophecy, deriving his expectation from a higher and a surer source, fully and unreservedly concurs.

Whatever small difference of opinion there may be respecting the precise commencement of the great period of three prophetic times and a half or 1260 natural years, the volume

\[ \text{Gr.} \delta \gamma
\]

\[ \text{2 Thess. ii. 8.} \]
of History precludes the rational possibility of doubt that that period must nearly have expired.

And, with this general computation, the passing signs of the times minutely correspond.

If the decree seems to have gone forth, at the very season when we might chronologically

1 Its commencement is fixed to the time, when the proper Roman Empire should have been broken into ten sovereignties, and when those sovereignties should have concurred to submit themselves to a yet eleventh smaller Sovereignty which should be springing up synchronically with them and which should be diverse from all its ten contemporaries. Dan. vii. 7, 8. 24, 25. Rev. xvii. 12, 13.

To determine the simple matter of fact, when the Roman Empire was thus broken into ten Sovereignties, and when those new Sovereignties unanimously submitted themselves to the domination of an eleventh smaller and characteristically different contemporaneous sovereignty, is, I apprehend, the legitimate province of independent History.

When this bare matter of fact shall have been determined by History, we cannot widely mistake the prophetically defined commencement of the 1200 years: and I take it, that, if the question be thus viewed, we shall be unable to avoid the conclusion; that we cannot, at present, be very greatly removed from the time of their expiration.
expect it to go forth, that preparation should be made for gathering together the Sovereignties of the whole corrupt Roman World to the great battle of the Lord God Almighty: the Ottoman Empire in the East, that well known and almost universally acknowledged subject of the sixth apocalyptic vial, is apparently hastening to its final dissolution.

When that most important event shall have occurred, the warning bell will have sounded which marks the lapse of a peculiarly well defined prophetic period: and he, that runneth, may read the remainder inscribed as with a sun-beam.

The seventh angel poured out his vial into the air: and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven from the throne, saying; It is done. And there were voices and thunders and lightnings: and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great. And the great city was divided into three parts; and the cities of the nations fell; and great Babylon came in remembrance before
God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath. And every island fled away: and the mountains were not found.

III. Well, then, both in principle and in practice, may we attend to that awful admonition of the Saviour, which he delivered with a special reference to the final overthrow of the long incorrigible and at length politically united Antichristian Faction.

Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he, that watcheth and keepeth his garments: lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.

Nor may we less profitably attend to the voice of his angel, at once announcing what might now seem to be of speedy occurrence, and ushering in a solemn declaration from heaven itself as to the duty of God's people in the great day of approaching calamity and of widely extensive revolutionary trouble.

He cried mightily with a strong voice, saying: Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen; and is

---


2 Rev. xvi. 15.
become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication: and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her: and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying: Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven: and God hath remembered her iniquities.

IV. Yet, casting our eyes with the full assurance of faith beyond the approaching period of tribulation and anguish, we may also look forward to the time, when, the head of apostatic wickedness having been effectually crushed, the triumph of the woman’s seed shall be complete, and the pure religion of the Messiah shall be universally victorious.

Without presuming too nicely to determine

---

1 Rev. xviii. 2—5.
the exact sense of unfulfilled prophecy, and certainly without feeling any need to adopt the very problematical speculation that Christ will visibly reign upon earth during the term of a millenary along with his literally resuscitated saints and martyrs; we are, nevertheless, by the concurring voices of the inspired writers, taught most unequivocally: that The predicted time of unexampled trouble, in the course of which what is called the battle of that great day of God Almighty will issue in the complete disruption of the mighty secular image of recapitulated apostasy, is destined to be succeeded by a long period of religious purity and consequently of hitherto unknown human happiness.

Thus far, in the midst of anticipated distress of nations with perplexity, and while men's hearts are even now failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: thus far, at least, we may safely and blamelessly theologise;

---

1 Rev. xvi. 14. Dan. ii. 34, 35, 44, 45. xii. 1.
thus far, resting upon our Lord's consolatory exhortation, and yet striving through grace to sit light to all sublunary matters, we may look up and lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh. With his faithful people, Christ will still be present, even when the figurative powers of heaven shall be shaken: and, whatever, so far as this passing world is concerned, may be the appointed lot of individuals; we assuredly know and believe, that his true Church is founded upon a rock against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, and that even upon earth a measure of glory will illustrate it such as mortal man has never yet witnessed.

*It shall come to pass, in the last days: that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.*

*For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. And,*

---

1 Luke xxii. 25, 26, 28.  
2 Isaiah ii. 2.
GENERAL CONCLUSION.

in that day, there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people. To it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious ¹.

And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom: and all dominions shall serve and obey him ².

¹ Isaiah xi. 9, 10. ² Dan. vii. 27.

THE END.
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