

NOTE ON THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND ITS DIVISIONS

Of the four monarchies--symbolized by metals in the image and by beasts in the vision of Daniel 7--that which is chiefly of interest to us is the fourth, for under it, during its changes and processes of division, do we now live. I shall therefore state the extent, etc., of that empire when it stood in its entirety, and then show (what to some minds is difficult to be understood) that this empire is that which still bears sway, though in a divided condition.

Let it be observed that I do not say that it is of absolute necessity for our spiritual apprehension of the vision that we should know the detail of geographical and historical facts. But surely we are, if we possess the opportunity, to compare such facts with Scripture, and thus use Scripture as giving us right thoughts as to the facts. If God gives us a prophecy in Scripture concerning Egypt or Tyre, we are of course to use those powers of observation with which He has furnished us so as to know what and where Egypt and Tyre are. How much more, then, must this be the case as to territories and nations with which we are ourselves concerned?

The power of Rome was of very gradual rise. The city, which at the first bore the name of *seven-hilled* (not from its being built on seven *different* hills, but only from seven ascents or points of hill on which it stood)¹ expanded as to its own circumference and as to its dominion, until it became the metropolis and mistress of the civilized earth; [that is,] until her sway extended throughout the East and the West alike.

The internal changes of the Roman commonwealth had been equally great. The stern republic of patricians, who on the one hand had expelled their kings and on the other had pressed down the plebeians, had been gradually compelled to admit all its citizens into almost every office of honor, trust, and power. The early course of Roman government, after the expulsion of the Tarquins, was in many respects like that which the state of Venice actually succeeded in establishing and perpetuating to the end of its independence of thirteen hundred years. Not so was the course of events as to Rome. Plebeians and patricians, in the latter days of its republic, were alike holders of power; and if certain honors in religious rites were the exclusive possession of the latter of these bodies, the substantial powers of the office of tribune belonged entirely to the former.

From this latter condition of the republic arose that imperial rule which was prefigured by the fourth beast seen in Daniel's vision.

At the time of this prophecy, the power of Rome was in an undeveloped condition. This vision was seen about half a century before the expulsion of the kings, an event which was followed by a

¹ The seven hills which originally gave the well-known designation to Rome were Palatium, Velia, Cermalus, Caelius, Fagutal, Oppius, Cispius. [So Niebuhr.] The three first of these belonged to the *Palatine*, the two next to the *Calian*, and the other two to the *Esquiline*; being thus, in fact, so many ascents, and not distinct hills. The name of Septicollis having been applied to Rome in its early form, was retained long after it ceased to be applicable in its original connection. After Rome had extended, it was supposed by some to relate to seven distinct hills: and thus the *number* was made to correspond by counting the Palatine, Capitoline, Quirinal, Esquiline, Caelian, Aventine, and the trans-Tiberine Janiculum. In this arrangement the Viminal (which lies between the Quirinal and the Esquiline) was omitted, in order not to exceed the number; in another arrangement, Janiculum, as being on the right side of the Tiber, was excluded and the Viminal reckoned. The seven hills were thus arbitrarily restricted to the left bank of the river, although the hill on the other side is the highest of the whole. In the days of Augustus and his successors, a large part of Rome had extended far beyond the hills and the intervening hollows, into the flat plain of the Campus Martius, which is the site of the greater part of the modern city of the popes.

long period of diminished power. At this very time the third monarchy (although the elements of which it was to be constructed were occupying a prominent place) had no formed nucleus, so utterly was all that God now revealed irrespective of the ideas of the future which human sagacity might form. God's *anticipative history* was *now* written as to the outlines of the monarchies of the earth, a century before the time of Herodotus, the father of profane history.

Rome had, in its republican days, added to its territories the kingdoms of several of Alexander's successors. The Egyptian sovereignty, however, still continued; and in it there was a perpetuation of the third great kingdom until the time when Rome should be a monarchy. This *almost* took place when Caius Julius Caesar made himself the virtual master of the Roman world. This same conqueror, besides what he added to the Roman territory in the west, so connected himself also with Egypt as to bring that last fragment of Grecian sovereignty under Roman influence. After the assassination of Julius Caesar, changes of a few years' duration followed. The western territory was in the hands of Octavius, the nephew and adopted son of Julius, while in the east Antonius had leagued a portion of the Roman power with Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, the last representative of Alexander's empire.

The battle of Actium (September 2, 31 B.C.) decided two things at once. It placed the sovereign authority of the Roman earth in the hands of Octavius, and it destroyed the power of the Egyptian kingdom. The two events occurred by a kind of necessary connection. Rome received the obelisks of Egypt to adorn the shores of the Tiber, and, acknowledging the imperial power in the hands of Octavius, bestowed on him the dignified designation of Augustus.²

At the commencement of the rule of the fourth monarchy, it possessed in Europe, Italy, Gaul, the Spanish peninsula, Greece, Macedon, Thrace, and Illyricum, so that its boundary was pretty nearly the line of the rivers Rhine and Danube; in Africa it possessed the northern coasts and Egypt; and in Asia, Syria, and Asia Minor, the Euphrates being about the limit. Judea, which formed at this time a dependent kingdom, became during the reign of Augustus a Roman province.

Such, then, was the original *empire* of the fourth beast. Under the successors of Augustus, other conquests were made. Britain, which had been invaded by Julius Caesar, and which for many subsequent years maintained only a commercial connection with Rome, was made a part of the empire, so far at least as the line of forts carried from the Clyde to the Forth.³ In Germany the Roman boundary was carried by a defined rampart from the Rhine near Bingen, along the Taunus mountains, then in a direction mostly southeast until it reached the Danube at the most northern point of that river. The Emperor Trajan added the province of Dacia, north of the Danube. The western boundary of this conquest was marked by a fortification skirting the extensive marshes which lie to the east of the river Theiss. The northern limit of Dacia crossed the Carpathian mountains to the river Dniester. In the east Trajan made many conquests beyond the Euphrates, but few of which were attempted to be retained as possessions. They might however be considered as belonging to the Roman empire in its widest extent. To the countries which have been mentioned must also be added the southern coasts of the Crimea.

Besides the conquests of Trajan, which were at once resigned, Rome withdrew in the reign of Aurelian from the province of Dacia. The *name* was thence forward given to a district south of

² The following extract from Spalding's (vol. 1, p. 96) describes the kind of authority which was exercised by Augustus. (**Note:** We have put this extract at the end of this chapter; see Appendix 1.)

³ This footnote appears at the end; see Appendix 2.

the Danube. In other points also there was afterwards some contraction of boundary. The Rhine from the lake of Constance and onward, had become the limit. From that lake the line was drawn northward to the Danube. Such was the extent of the Roman earth at the time of the division into East and West.

Before the formal division of the imperial power there had frequently been a partition of the sovereign authority of Rome. Thus Augustus, the first emperor, associated with himself in his later years Tiberius, who became his successor. In the second century the principle of association in the imperial rank and authority became frequent in the time of the Antonines, but still the empire was not divided as to its *territory*. This was almost the case in the latter part of the third century, when Diocletian, two years after his assumption of the imperial dignity, took (in 286) Maximian as his associate in the empire. From this time the *administration* was divided; and the one emperor making Nicomedia in Bithynia his place of government and the other Milan, Rome itself ceased as much to be the actual seat and centre of empire as Macedon had in the latter days of Alexander's successors.

Under Constantine there was again a united empire. But this monarch, by founding the city (which still bears his name) on the side of the ancient Byzantium, gave a principle of permanence to the territorial division; for he thus established what has been from that time and onward the metropolis of the eastern empire. Constantine at his death (in 337) divided his dominions among his *three* sons, a form of partition which lasted but three years.

After the death of the last surviving son of Constantine, and the short reigns of his two successors, the formal division of the government of the empire into East and West took place. In the year 364 Valentinian I retained the West for himself and invested his brother, Valens, with the empire of the East. The line of division was nearly that which separates Thrace from Macedon, [and] continued northward to the Danube. Crete, with some of the islands of the Aegean sea, were appropriated to the West; and in Africa the western limit of Cyrene was the boundary.

In *this* division it was intended that the West should be the more important empire. However, in 395, when the East was appropriated to Arcadius, the eldest son of Theodosius the Great, and the West to Honorius, his younger brother, the boundary was so changed as to unite the greater part of what is now European Turkey to the East. The boundary left the shores of the Adriatic, between Ragusa and the mouths of the Cattaro, and running northward till it approached the river Save, reached that stream by a bend to the east.

In the year 425, when Theodosius II took Valentinian III as his associate in the empire, he united a still further portion of territory to the East; the West (of which the seat of government was now Ravenna) no longer retained the provinces east of Venetia and Rhaetia. The boundary was thus formed by the Julian Alps, then by a line drawn to the river Inn just where its course turns to the north (at the point where it now flows from the Austrian into the Bavarian territory), and then by the course of the Inn to the Danube.

This was the definite line of demarcation by which the Roman earth was fully divided into East and West. The separation was occasioned by internal as well as external causes. Within, the empire had consisted of elements utterly distinct, mentally and morally; it needed a strong hand to cause such contrary materials to coalesce. And when the Parthian power on the east and the vast immigration of tribes from the north pressed on the Roman territory, a separation of

administration was almost the necessary result. Thus the long-admitted principle of association in the empire now assumed the form of distinct and separate government.⁴

The western empire soon became a prey to the northern invaders, so that in 475 the succession ceased in the person of Romulus Augustulus. Not so however at Constantinople, where, with varied circumstances and a circumscribed territory, the imperial dignity continued until it expired with the last Constantine, when (in 1453) the eastern metropolis passed into the hands of Mahometan invaders.

This, then, is the empire whose whole extent is marked out in prophecy as that which shall be divided into *ten* kingdoms, just as the dominion of Alexander was separated into four.

It may be questioned whether with regard to this division the empire must be looked at as it existed under Augustus, or in its widest extent, or according to its limits when the complete division took place of East and West. The first of these limits is not, I believe, the true one (reasons for this opinion will appear presently); and as to the second, it may be doubted whether territories which Rome voluntarily resigned could be regarded as integral parts of the empire. Hence it seems to me that we should include Southern Britain, and take on the Continent the line of the Danube and Rhine in a general sense.⁵

In this territory, according to the terms of Daniel's prophecy (written before Rome rose to be a mighty power) and according to the Apocalypse (seen when that power had almost approached its height), we may expect a division to be found into ten kingdoms.

We have, in accordance with Scripture, to look at all the present period as one in which changes and divisions take place within the Roman earth prior to that tenfold development into kingdoms which shall precede the rise of the terrible but transient horn of blasphemy.

Does this seem difficult to any mind? If so, let it be considered that in the vision of Daniel 7 the fourth beast is regarded as reigning *until* the Son of Man takes the kingdom and His saints take it with him. If this has not taken place as yet, then the fourth beast still bears rule, however changed may be the form of his power.

The example of the third beast may illustrate this. The united empire of Alexander began to dissolve at his death. But still, as long as any of its great divided parts remained as sovereignties (whatever changes they had undergone), any person would have been living under the third

4 The Roman hold on Britain was almost entirely relinquished at the time of this ultimate division of empire. In the year 383, when the usurper Maximus endeavored to establish his authority in the west, he left Britain with all the military force that he could raise. This army never returned; and as its place was not supplied, and as Roman policy had put the defence of the provinces into the hands of strangers or of military colonists, the Britons were left almost unprotected. They had to oppose the northern Caledonians and maritime marauders. Only about twelve years had elapsed before the Britons were compelled to apply to the court of Ravenna for aid, when they received inadequate succours. The sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 shook the imperial power in distant provinces, and this event virtually closed the Roman rule over Britain. At the beginning of this century we find the twentieth legion no longer in the island, the second was removed from Caerleon to Richborough in Kent (Rutupiae), while the northern defences of the sixth legion at York and the troops on the wall of Hadrian still continued. In 418 there was a great migration of the Roman population from Britain, and the final abandonment by Roman troops took place in 436.

5 The Emperor Caracalla (whose reign began in 211) extended the privilege of Roman citizenship to all persons born within the empire who were not slaves. This was done for the purpose of raising an increased property tax. It had, however, a very important effect in giving a certain unity to the races within the empire.

beast. This would have been true before the battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.) effected the fourfold division. It would have been equally true when that great division had in many respects changed, and until the fourth beast had by the conquest of Egypt superseded the last of the four Grecian sovereignties.

In one respect the third and fourth beasts stand in definite contrast. The fourfold division of Alexander's empire took place without any great interval of years after his death; and then other changes ensued. The territory of the fourth beast, whether intermediate divisions had taken place or not, was to be found separated into ten kingdoms just *before its utter destruction* by the Lord Himself. Thus, unless we can say that Christ has taken *His* kingdom and destroyed the divided sovereignties of Rome, we are still living under this fourth monarchy; and its tenfold division is what we must expect.

How fully the *Roman* character has been impressed on the sovereignties formed within its territory is shown by the circumstances of their rise. They were in general founded by some king or chief of an invading tribe, who succeeded in planting his people within the imperial territory; over his own followers he possessed a defined military authority. To the Roman provincials it was a very indifferent matter *who* their sovereign might be. They were heavily taxed and dispirited, so that to the greater part of them it seemed preferable to be ruled by a military conqueror who from local connection might be interested in improving their condition, than by an emperor who secluded himself in the luxury of Ravenna, or one who, reigning on the shore of the Bosphorus, cared only for the eastern provinces. The provincials too had seen examples enough of barbarian rule during the days of the united empire not to object to any sovereign because of his birth or nation. Thus they acknowledged their new rulers as holders of Roman *imperium*, and regarded them as possessed of that absolute power which the Roman emperors had claimed and exercised.

The new rulers willingly accepted the acknowledgment of the provincials; and thus, without exchanging their kingly titles for the imperial *name*, they governed as holding an associated authority within the empire. The twofold power which they thus possessed, that over their original followers and that over the provincials, led to the development of new forms of government containing opposing principles. The followers of the invading chiefs owed them but a kind of limited allegiance. They possessed privileges which were as indefeasible as was the power of the sovereign. The new subjects, on the contrary, knew of no relations between the governed and those governing, other than had been recognized by Roman rule.⁶ The municipalities, indeed, had possessed certain privileges; and when permanent conquest and not mere devastation was the object of the invaders, they found it to be for their own interest to

⁶ Thus it has been said that the Franks occupied the soil of Gaul for three centuries, without any amalgamation having taken place between the new dominant body and the old Roman provincials. The terms might seem to be borrowed from what Daniel 2 says of the iron and clay. From the relation in which the followers of the invading leaders stood to them sprang much of the notion of modern European *nobility*. The almost *independent* ground which this class could assume, seven centuries ago, shows what a limited allegiance chiefs *even then* rendered to their sovereigns. Thus the original form of the homage of the Aragonese nobles to the sovereign ran thus: "We *who are as good as you, and together are more than you, will be faithful to you as our king and lord, if you govern us well and truly, IF NOT, NOT.*" The privilege of remaining covered in the presence of the sovereign is all that the Spanish nobles *now* retain of these high-sounding claims. So long as the ancient office of hereditary Lord High Steward of England continued, the sovereign was treated, *in word*, with as much independence. This officer, at the coronation of a king, receiving from his hands a sword, addressed him thus, "With this sword I will defend thee, so long as thou governest well, as thou hast sworn; but with this sword I and the people of England will depose thee, if thou governest contrary to thy coronation oath." After the attainder and execution of the Duke of Buckingham in the reign of Henry VIII, this office and ceremony ceased.

preserve such bodies. It was by means of the municipalities, with their local organization, that much of what had been Roman floated above the wreck of ages down to our days.⁷

The twofold relations of the new sovereigns seem to have occasioned what we should now call constitutional governments, in which, however, almost all that controlled the king was to be found among his original followers. From the greater submission of the provincials, the kings had an interest in bestowing on them such privileges as might check (what might be termed) the military nobility.

In some cases the kings, whose power had arisen within the Roman earth, sought and obtained imperial recognition from Constantinople. This was the case in England, where, during the days of the Heptarchy, one sovereign bore supreme rule, being acknowledged as an associate in the empire by the reigning emperor in the East. Hence we find on Saxon coins the title ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, as borne by the Greek Emperors, and the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus. Thus did the invading rulers, who had established themselves in this country, identify themselves with the authority, the institutions, and with the historical associations of Ancient Rome. This fact indicates (as it appears to me) that we are not to exclude from the prophetic history of the Roman earth such territories as were not included within its limits in the days of Augustus.⁸

Although from the year 476 there ceased to be an emperor reigning in the West, the authority of the imperial name was not finally extinct in its original centre of dominion. Odoacer, the king of the Heruli (a tribe issuing from the shores of the Baltic), who in 476 had deposed Romulus Augustulus, was invested, at the request of the Roman senate, with the title of Patrician by Zeno, the eastern emperor; and under this designation he exercised sovereign power. Theodoric, the king of the Ostrogoths, by whom Odoacer was displaced and slain (in 493), had been educated at Constantinople; and it was as a province of the empire, and under the (disregarded) condition of tribute, that he received the grant of Italy from Zeno. In the middle of the following century the victories of Belisarius and Narses united to the empire of Justinian the Carthaginian provinces, Italy, and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. That part of which continued to belong to the Empire after the Lombard invasion was ruled by a governor bearing the title of *Exarch*, whose abode was at Ravenna. Thus was the direct authority of the emperors maintained over and other portions of the West, till the year 731.

Seventy years had not passed from that date when Charlemagne, the monarch of the Franks and the German tribes, was (in the year 800) solemnly crowned emperor at Rome by the pope. This has been regarded by some as though he thus became the *remote* successor of Augustulus. It was, however, rather as the associate of Irenè--then ruling the eastern empire--that the imperial dignity and name were conferred on the western conqueror.

In his family the imperial title continued with diminished lustre. At Coblenz, in the church of St. Castor, his descendants agreed to divide his territories. And after various vicissitudes, the

⁷ In this country, London held a remarkable place as a municipality. It seems to have risen to its importance through traffic, between the time of Julius Caesar and the Roman occupation under Claudius. It afterwards became the capital of the country, though not a military station. After the departure of the Romans, it maintained a kind of municipal independence; and it was not until the consolidation of the Saxon kingdoms that it submitted to the supreme state, without however giving up its own privileges. Thus, in the changes of dynasties, religions, and races, London, as a municipality, has been the most stable of the links of connection between the present hour and the time of Roman rule. The whole history of the municipalities has thrown (by means of modern research) no small light on the permanence of Roman institutions.

⁸ You will find this footnote at the end; see Appendix 3.

title of Roman Emperor, together with the supremacy over Italy (*real* at that time), was appropriated in the person of Otho, 962, to an elective German monarch. But though his rule was *principally* beyond the Alps, yet for ages it was considered that the imperial title was not rightly his until he had been crowned in Rome as Emperor of the West.

The latest traces of the power of the eastern emperors in the West are to be found in the Italian islands and the territory of Naples. Much of the latter was conquered from the Lombards in 891 by the generals of the Emperor Leo. And even after the Norman kingdom Naples of had arisen in the eleventh century, the claim of Constantinople was not withdrawn; nor was it till 1157 that William of Naples was acknowledged as king by the Greek emperor.

Thus it was by gradual steps that changes took place in the Roman earth; and thus plain is it that the sovereignties of Southwestern Europe not only *were*, but *were considered* to be, perpetuations of Roman power.

This sometimes led to *formal* transactions resembling the ancient assumption of an associate in the empire. Thus in November 1337 the Emperor Lewis, the Bavarian, met Edward III of England at Coblenz; and there at the church at St. Castor, where the empire had been divided five hundred years before, he constituted him Imperial Vicar of all territories and peoples on the left bank of the Rhine, with authority to coin money in those districts--an authority on which he acted at Antwerp. This imperial title was distinctly declared in an Act of Parliament in the time of his grandson Henry IV, and it explains part of the ceremonial observed in the threefold coronation of Queen Elizabeth--first, as Queen of England; second, Queen of Ireland; third, "Sovereign Lady and Empress of all Nations and Countries from the Islands Orcades to the Mountains Pyrenees."

Thus, though the Ottoman arms destroyed the imperial name and power in the East in the fifteenth century, its different western branches have continued, whether as bearing imperial or royal names. It was common to consider France as *successionally* perpetuating the empire in the West,⁹ while even to our days the head of the Germanic body was styled Roman emperor and successor of Augustus.

It may be questioned whether the tenfold division of the Roman earth must be precisely in accordance with its geographical boundaries. But at all events it seems clear that the *seat* of all the kingdoms must be *within* the Roman bounds as well as the main body of the territory. Further than this it may not be safe to venture an opinion. The Romans *conquered* far beyond the limits which they retained. The Eyder, between Holstein and Schleswig, appears to have been the line to which they penetrated in that direction. They also occupied military positions beyond the boundaries of the empire, just as Napoleon held Magdeburg and other places which were no part of his territory. Thus there may be districts beyond the Roman earth which will be connected with parts of the ten kingdoms. It is "*out of*" the fourth kingdom that ten others arise, whatever exterior territory any of them may possess or conquer.

From the vision of Daniel 2 and that of chap. 7, we may see that the ten kingdoms do not arise until a certain process of deterioration (the mixture of clay with iron) is complete; and that these kingdoms, when all developed, have not any protracted course before them. Just as the

⁹ This was done partly through the strange transaction between Andreas PaIaeologus and Charles VIII in 1494; the latter, in 1495, when in session of Naples, formally received and bore the title of *Emperor*. He seems to have considered himself as then holding part of the *Eastern Empire*.

sovereignty out of which they sprung was secular, so of course are they also secular. Whatever have been the changes in the Roman earth, as yet we have not seen the definite tenfold division. Indeed, had we seen it, we could have expected nothing other than the appearance of the last horn and the judgment of the Son of Man at his coming.

To suppose this last horn to be the Papacy would interfere with almost every point that the visions in Daniel teach us. It would involve us in the supposition that before the rise of the Papacy the imperial power had passed away, and that its territory was in the hands of ten definite kings. If so, those kingdoms must continue as such (unless the *three* which fall before the last horn be excepted) until the coming of Christ; whereas we know how change after change has passed upon Europe since the Poppedom began. The *time* at which many have sought for ten kingdoms has been the fifth and sixth centuries, and they have mostly sought them in the invading hosts. But although Rome had been severed for a time from the imperial sway, and though many provinces had become independent kingdoms, the dignity of emperor still continued, and the power of those who held it was again to be exercised over *Rome itself* for two centuries. This might have been an intimation that it was vain to look for the defined division, *even of the West*, at least before the year 731. But of course we ought not (if we follow the terms of the vision) to exclude the East even after that year--five toes were on each foot of the image. And thus we are led on, so as to find that no point of time *prior* to the extinction of the imperial name and power at Constantinople (1453) *could* be assigned for any such division.

The tenfold division of the Roman empire (even if we had a right to exclude the eastern half) could never be definitely pointed out, whether in the early centuries or since. The lists differ exceedingly; and very frequently countries wholly disconnected with the Roman empire are introduced simply because in later days they have been upholders of the Poppedom.¹⁰ But even *if* the lists of kings could be made out, and *if* the commencement of the divisions of the empire were the proper time (and not a little before the second advent of Christ), it would still remain to be shown *how* the Poppedom then rose after the ten kings, and how it destroyed three of the former kings, and *what three*.

Some place the rise of the Papacy, as the little horn, in the reign of Justinian, in the middle of the sixth century. At that very time, however, the Poppedom, both in temporal and spiritual things, was ruled over by Justinian. Vigilius, the weak and vacillating Roman bishop who, according to circumstances, adopted or renounced the monophysite heresy, possessed no temporal

¹⁰ The following note from (the late) Mr. Conder's *Literary History of the New Testament* (p. 576), shows what ideas have been advanced as the division of the Roman empire into ten kingdoms: "At the epoch of A.D. 532, which is fixed upon by Mr. Elliott, there existed on the platform of the western Roman empire the following ten kingdoms: the Anglo-Saxons, the Franks, the Allman Franks, the Burgundians, the Visigoths, the Suevi, the Vandals, the Ostrogoths, the Bavarians, and the Lombards. Notwithstanding many intervening revolutions and changes in Western Europe, ten has generally been noted as the number of the Papal kingdoms. Thus Gibbon, speaking of Roger, first king of Sicily, A.D. 1130, says: 'The nine kings of the Latin world might disclaim their new associate unless he were consecrated by the authority of the supreme pontiff.' The nine kings were those of France, England, Scotland, Castille, Aragon, Navarre, Sweden, Denmark, Hungary." I do not discuss the points stated as historical facts (such as whether there was *one* united Anglo-Saxon kingdom in 532). The kingdoms being sought in the *West* alone is sufficient to show the fallacy of the scheme which ignores the eastern empire. The date, too, is not a fortunate one, as it is just before the eastern emperors again extended their influence over the West. But what relation has the extract from Gibbon to the matter in hand? If we are to seek for ten kingdoms in the Roman empire, to the Roman empire let us confine ourselves. On what principle are we to bring in countries never Roman, such as *Sweden* and *Denmark*? And if we take the *West* Roman empire, why wander as far as *Hungary*, which never did or could pertain to it? (See note on Luther's enumeration at the end of this chapter.)

authority; and in doctrinal points he bound himself by oath to the emperor. As if to reverse the relations in which things afterwards stood, the emperor declared the pope, when unsubmissive, to be excluded from the fellowship of the Church.

Others regarded the Papacy as thus arising when Boniface III was addressed by the Emperor Phocas in 606 as "Universal Bishop".¹¹ That the secular authority of Rome then belonged to the emperor, we have proof existing in the Roman Forum itself--where in our days excavations around "the nameless column with the buried base" have caused the base to be no longer buried and the column to be no longer nameless, since the inscription on the pedestal shows that it was erected to the honor of this very Phocas by his Italian representative. How completely the popes were *subjects* at a later period is shown in the case of Pope Martin I, who, for his firm opposition to the monothelite heresy, was seized at Rome in 653 as a traitor to the emperor, and after having been conveyed to Constantinople, ended his days in banishment at the ancient Cherson in the Crimea.

It is to the age of Pepin and his son Charlemagne that we must descend before we find the popes as holders of temporal sovereignty. This, however, they held as feudatories of the western emperors, so that Leo III was required by Charlemagne to vindicate himself from treasonable charges.

In later days popes did indeed claim a power of conferring sovereignty, as though all the kingdoms of the earth were theirs; but this was not through the territorial dominion which they held, but as a supposed attribute of their spiritual jurisdiction. As yet they claimed no part of the dominion of the Caesars, for even in the districts of Italy ruled by the popes the inhabitants swore allegiance to the emperors. It was not till the accession of Rudolf of Hapsburg, 1273, that the popes claimed *independent temporal* rule. The claim was admitted by the emperor, more occupied with trans-alpine than Italian objects. And thus, from 1278, the oath of allegiance to the emperor was not imposed in the territory of the popes, who thus became independent secular sovereigns--an accession of dignity which was soon marked by a double crown, and then by the triple, as still borne.¹²

11 The title of "Universal Bishop" had been used for some time in the East as a complimentary title. It was not intended to signify that the person to whom it was applied excluded the jurisdiction of other bishops, nor yet was it so understood as if it could belong to *one* only. In England the legal designation of the Archbishop of Canterbury is "Primate of ALL England"; but this is not designed to interfere with the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of York, within his own province, who is styled "Primate of England." This may illustrate the complimentary character of this high-sounding title. Complimentary designations, when expressed by *superlatives*, are never *strictly* interpreted. More has been made out of the title of "Universal Bishop" than it really involves. Boniface III accepted a title which the cooler judgment of his predecessor, Gregory I, had rejected. The *title* gave no added jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal.

12 How *gradually* the popes acquired independent temporal sovereignty is shown by their transactions with the emperors. "Since the revival of the Roman Empire under Otho the Great (962), the emperors had regularly placed in Rome a prefect or legate, who swore allegiance to them, and exercised a control over the civil administration . . . "At home the pontiffs were weak, often despised, and sometimes expelled; but abroad their name grew and flourished. . . . The minority of Frederick II enabled the resolute Innocent III (1198-1216), a middle-aged Roman noble, to fortify the temporal sovereignty of the holy see over a large district of Central Italy. He revived, and, partly by force, partly by the submission of the principal towns, was able to bring into effect that famous donation by which, in the times of Hildebrand and his successor, the Countess Matilda of Tuscany had bequeathed to the Papal see her extensive fiefs, the Duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona." - Spalding's *Italy*, ii. 103, 105. The entire *independence* of the Papal states was secured in 1278. During the secession to Avignon (1305-77), however, and the subsequent schism of the West (1378-1417), the power of the popes over them was weakened and in part destroyed, so that it was not till after the French occupation of Italy in 1494 under Charles VIII, that the Papal

But the actuality of a secular kingdom did not increase the Papal influence in temporal things. Boniface VIII sought in vain to bestow kingdoms and to resume them, as Innocent III had done a century before. From that time, in temporalities, the popes became petty Italian sovereigns, while in spiritual things their authority was equally recognized as before. Such were the steps by which the popes gained secular sovereignty, for which secular sovereignty alone we are now concerned. It was that, and that alone, which had belonged to the Caesars; and the divided parts of their dominion could not be something differing entirely in kind from the dominion itself.

Thus there is really no point of time at which we could apply the vision of Daniel 7 to the Papacy. We must look at the Roman power still continuing in its divided parts, and expect that its ultimate condition will be a tenfold division into kingdoms in which strength and weakness will be combined; when, three years and a half before the second advent of Christ, a power of blasphemy and persecution will arise who will overthrow three of the former kings.

The spread and use of the Roman law illustrates the continuance of the Roman power. Throughout the Roman earth, Roman law became the basis of all jurisprudence; and though modified by custom or direct enactment, it still furnishes a body of principles of wide and various application. The *Corpus Juris Civilis* itself supplies evidence of the continuance of Roman power and institutions; for there we find enactments of the Henrys and Frederics of the house of Hohenstaufen, as co-ordinate with those of Severus, Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian. The same imperial authority attaches to the decree of Henry VII of Luxemburg (in which he styles Constantine "our illustrious predecessor"), dated in 1313 from Pisa, as to the Pandects of Justinian, the ancient *Pisan* MS of which* was the instructor of the dark ages, and laid the foundation of that maritime law which all civilized states alike recognize.¹³

What does this long statement of facts teach? Does it supply us with new light as to the bearing of Daniel's prophecies, different from what we should have learned from the Scripture itself?

territorial rule was consolidated. From that time it received various additions till the year 1644. In modern days the whole of the Papal dominions have been swept away from their priestly sovereigns, and all (with the exception of Avignon and its territory) have been again restored and confirmed. (Since this was written, other changes have caused a loss of a large portion; all, indeed, except what is held through French aid. And thus it has been increasingly shown that the temporal power is not essential to the Papacy. 1863.

13 The *Pisan Codex* is said to have been brought thither from Amalfi. After the subjection of Pisa to Florence this MS became one of the spoils of the victorious city, where it is still preserved in the Laurentian library. In connection with Roman law it may be observed that Britain seems to have profited not a little. York was the place where Papinian, the celebrated jurist, presided in the early part of the third century. The law school in that city continued to flourish after the Saxon occupation had driven the name of Christianity out of the most part of England, and after the labors of Roman missionaries had again triumphed over idolatry. We find proofs of the existence of this from the seventh to the ninth century. (Luther gave an enumeration of ten kingdoms which did not exclude the East; but then he supposed the power which destroyed three of them be not Papal but Mahometan. "The Anti-Christian power spoken of in Dan. 11: 39, etc., was the Pope; that of Dan. 7: 8, etc., the Turk. The Ten horns of the last or Roman kingdom were Spain, France, Italy, Africa, Egypt, Syria, Asia, Greece, Germany, etc. The Little Horn coming up among them, or Mahomet, plucked up three of them by the roots, viz. Egypt, Asia, (? Africa), and Greece. Walch. xx, p. 2691, etc." *Life of Martin Luther*, by Henry Worsley, M.A., ii. 184, note.

To the Scripture we may adhere simply. Facts, or supposed facts, can never alter the force of what the Spirit of God has caused to be written. This statement of facts is intended (and I trust it may serve) to show that *objections* to the simple reception of Scripture teaching, *when based on facts in their supposed bearing*, are manifested to be groundless so soon as the facts themselves are correctly presented. History thus possesses a *negative value*, and enables us to cast aside difficulties with which some would obscure the force of God's word.

APPENDIX 1

Extract from Spalding's *Italy*

"The title by which Augustus pretended to the sovereignty was that of a free election by the people, renewed from time to time. All names, forms, and ceremonies, which the free constitution held illegal, were carefully shunned; and all that the spirit of liberty had honoured were protected and brought paradingly forward. But the republicanism was a wretched mask through which every man of information saw distinctly, though none was strong enough to tear off the disguise. From the very commencement of the first reign all the powers, both of the senate, the popular conventions, and the magistracies, were virtually and effectually secured to the emperor. The new prince united by degrees in his own person all the ancient offices of state; or, at least, though he allowed the appointment of colleagues, he entrusted to them no share of the real administration. He founded, on his assumption of the tribuneship, a claim of personal inviolability, and his title of Imperator, which we translate Emperor, a prerogative of absolute military command, not only beyond the city, which was the republican rule, but also within it--an extension of powers which directly contradicted the old constitution. *His generalship of the armies, indeed, aided by the official weakness and personal subserviency of the senate, constituted the true ground on which his monarchy rested.* But, in appearance, he was only the first of senators; the august forms of the assembly were treated with profound respect; and the sovereign sheltered his ordinances under its name."

Such was the nature of Roman monarchy. It comprehended the absolute *military* Imperium beyond the city; to this it added a similar Imperium, not so confined, decreed by the senate; and, as a third element, it comprehended the Tribunitian power derived from the *people*--the long-cherished prerogative which the plebeians had earned for themselves on the day of their secession to the Mons Sacer.

Julius Caesar had endeavoured, like Sulla, to rule as perpetual dictator, a *name* of ancient historic importance in Rome, but utterly deprived of its old significance by the adjunct of *perpetual*. When Caesar fell beneath the daggers of conspirators, staining with his blood the statue of Pompey, the name and office of dictator were abolished by the senate. It was therefore no longer available for his politic nephew when he rose to supreme power. In the three-fold relation in which he stood as connected with the army, the senate, and the *plebs*, he combined that substantiality of power which he never could have done had he, like his uncle, depended on mere military prowess or on the support of one class.

APPENDIX 2

Roman Britain

Roman Britain - The first invasion of this island by Rome was conducted by Julius Caesar, who, on the 26th of August, 55 B.C., in the consulship of Pompey and Crassus, planted the standard of the eagle on our shores. But Caesar founded no permanent dominion in Britain. He left no garrison, and added no territory to the Roman state. However, from that day Britain was known to the Romans; and in the reign of Augustus not a little commercial intercourse had sprung up. Hence parts of the island were Romanised before they were at all brought under the sway of Rome. The subjugation of the island was undertaken by Claudius a century after the expedition of Julius Caesar. The exports of grain from Britain had rendered its possession an object of importance in the eyes of Rome. Of the Roman legions, originally sent into Britain by Claudius, the *second* was stationed at Caerleon-upon-Usk and the *twentieth* at Chester. These, together with the *sixth*, brought over by the Emperor Hadrian, and stationed at York, formed the permanent garrison of our island. Besides these troops, however, there were also military colonists out of almost every conceivable part of the Roman empire, placed at different stations. Among other names we find those of Thracians, Dacians, Spaniards, Moors, Dalmatians, Batavians, Sarmatians, and *Indians*. These heterogeneous tribes introduced their own forms of idolatry, so that under the Roman dominion there was hardly a single kind of worship then known which did not flourish. This fact is attested by inscriptions and altars still extant. Under the Roman rule Christianity had penetrated into Britain, and that, probably, at an early period, so that the Roman dominion was instrumental in spreading the gospel of Christ. There is even reason for supposing that some of those whose names occur in the end of the Second Epistle to Timothy were Britons; at least the names of Pudens, Linus, and Claudia were at that very time borne by three of a family in part British. The Diocletian persecution found some of its martyrs in Britain, of whom *Alban*, who suffered at Verulamium (the metropolis of Cassivellaunus in Caesar's days), was the first. That persecution however was greatly restrained in the western countries which were under the rule of Constantius Chlorus. At the Council of Arles, in 314, we find the subscriptions of three British bishops; and before the close of the fourth century Britons joined with others in the vain pilgrimages to Jerusalem.

Among the more important events during the Roman occupation of Britain were the deaths of Septimius Severus, at York in 211, and of Constantius Chlorus, in 306 at the same city. This caused his son Constantine to assume the imperial purple, which led to the cessation of all persecutions of Christians. The extent of the Roman dominion in Britain varied at different times. The rampart of Hadrian (the Picts' wall, as it is often called) crossed the island from Carlisle to Newcastle. But the vallum of Antoninus included a greater extent of country, running as it did from the Forth to the Clyde, while even farther north there were Roman towns.

APPENDIX 3

Sir Francis Palgrave in his *Anglo-Saxon Commonwealth* has done much to show the relation in which sovereignty within the Roman empire, and in particular in Britain, was connected with imperial recognition and association.

The rise of Saxon rule, however, was marked by some peculiarities. At the departure of the Romans, three races occupied the country: First, the non-Romanised Britons, whose abode was principally to the west of the Severn and Exe. Second, the Romans and the mixed population which had become Romanised. The districts *especially* Romanised were the country from Bath and Cirencester, northeastward as far as Northamptonshire, and southeastward as far as Sussex. Third, the Saxon population, which thus early had established themselves. This body of inhabitants were probably confined to the *littus Saxonicum*, from the south of Kent to the edge of Lincolnshire. The settlement of this Teutonic race seems to have originated in their mercantile and predatory expeditions, which led to their being encouraged by the Romans, in the hope, probably, that they would guard the exposed coast. It was apparently the frequency of piratical attacks which caused the removal of the second legion from Caerleon to Richborough.

After the withdrawal of the Romans, sovereignty became independent among the non-Romanised Britons, while the Roman population sought weakly and vainly to maintain their authority in the island. The dominion of the Saxons arose, not by breaking down Roman authority, but by occupying the ground which Rome had left vacant. Successive bodies of Saxons, Jutes, and *Angles* (the last being the race whose *name* was to be perpetuated) planted themselves in Britain, and the only independence from their sway was found by withdrawal to the non-Romanised Britons in Wales and Cornwall. The partially-received Christianity was so extinguished, except in those districts, that on the arrival of Augustine the Monk in 596 (one hundred and sixty years after the final withdrawal of the Romans), not one Christian, whether Roman or Saxon, could he find--and that in a land whose bishops had assisted at early councils; and where Christian profession had so far extended, that important doctrinal differences were widely discussed and much pains bestowed for rooting out errors and teaching dogmatic truth.