



of the Advent of that Redeemer, by whom those fatal consequences were to be one day overruled :—" Oh !" exclaims the Arabian patriarch, " that my words were now written ! oh, that they were printed in a book ! that they were graven with an iron pen, and lead, in the rock for ever ! For I know that my Redeemer liveth ; and that He shall stand, at the latter day, upon the earth ! " *

With this prophetic confession of faith in the future Messiah, is coupled a vivid recognition of the great evangelical doctrine of the resurrection.† In both respects, the views disclosed in this wonderful book appear to surpass any revealed in the books of Moses. Insomuch, that, to use the words of Bishop Sherlock, " we find *clearer knowledge of divine truth among the ancient Arabians*, than among the privileged descendants of Abraham ; and see a plain prophetic description of *the grand article of the Gospel* ‡, even before the giving of their own law."

The moral evidence thus furnished by the book of Job, appears to be conclusive for the origin of his religion. The perfected faith of Abraham is there too legibly engraven, not to have sprung from Abraham.

The idea of a designed providential connection between the religion of the Jews, and that of the Abrahamic Arabians, may be strikingly illustrated, from the place occupied, by this inspired poem, in the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures. The fact is assuredly significant, that probably the most ancient portion of the Old Testament, certainly that containing some of the profoundest and most pregnant anticipations of the Messiah's kingdom, should have been the production of an Idumæan Arab ; and should have been adopted, from the first, as an integral part of the volume of Jewish revelation.

But, when we descend to subsequent periods of Jewish

* Job, xix. 23—25.

† Job, xix. 26, 27.

‡ It is surely very remarkable, that the doctrine of a *resurrection of the body* should have been preserved in great vigour, in Arabia, to the time of Mahomet. The peculiarity of the doctrine gives great weight to this agreement with the book of Job.



history, we can trace the continued existence, in Arabia, of the patriarchal faith professed by Job and Jethro, in the scriptural notices of the *Kenites* and *Rechabites*, the lineal descendants of the father-in-law of Moses.

When Moses conducted his people, from the neighbourhood of Mount Horeb, to the borders of Canaan, he was attended on the march by a part of the Midianitish tribe, or family, of the *Kenites*, led by his brother-in-law Hobab *, who acted as his guides. After the Israelites had entered into possession of the land of promise, this Arab tribe of the *Kenites* took up their residence in the inheritance of Judah †; but without intermingling with the Jews, or conforming to their civil or religious usages. For it is on record, that the *Kenites* preserved their primitive manners; continued, like their Arabian ancestors, to dwell in tents; and (contrary alike to the precedent of the *Ishmaelites* and of the *Jews*) did not even practise the rite of circumcision. The religious belief of the *Kenites* or *Rechabites*, therefore, was clearly independent of Judaism. And there seems every likelihood, further, that it continued to be, in substance, the same which they had originally brought with them out of the Arabian desert.

Now the quality of this, their patriarchal faith, and its acceptableness in the sight of God, may be illustrated from sacred history, at distant intervals of time, on two memorable occasions.

1. In the reign of Jehu, we find Jehonadab, the son of Rechab; a distinguished chief of his tribe, specially chosen by the king of Israel, as "the witness of his zeal for the Lord," and presiding, in conjunction with his sovereign, over the execution of the idolatrous priests of Baal.

2. In the age of the prophet Jeremiah, we meet the tribe of the *Rechabites* †; the posterity of this Jonadab, cha-

* Numb. x. 29—32.

† Judg. i. 16.

‡ The history of this nomade people is the subject of perhaps the most perfect model of an historical sermon in the English language; the discourse entitled "The History of the *Rechabites*," by the late venerable Thomas



racterized, even in those deplorable days of apostasy and desolation, as a people eminent for piety and virtue. On which accounts, they were then selected by Jehovah, as their ancestor had been three hundred years before, for a standing witness against the far more highly-favoured, yet perverse and disobedient sons of Israel.

It is needless to enlarge on the valuable character of the

Townson, D.D. Rector of Malpas in Cheshire. This Sermon contains the best summary extant, of the scriptural notices of the Rechabites and Kenites. And, in consulting it for a critical purpose, the reader will scarcely fail to derive a high moral gratification. See Dr. Townson's Works, vol. ii.

The promise made to the house of the Rechabites in the time of Jeremiah, appears to be in operation to the present day. It has been stated by Mr. Wolff, the German missionary, in his Journal, that he found this erratic tribe still existing in Arabia, in the vicinity of Mount Horeb; that he subsequently fell in with one of their encampments, in the neighbourhood of Mecca; and that, although otherwise grossly ignorant, they still religiously abstain from wine, and continue to dwell in tents, — assigning as the reason of both observances, that it was so commanded them, by Jonadab their forefather. Mr. W. further mentions, that, to their faithful observance of the latter of those precepts, he was indebted for a most providential escape from the great earthquake at Aleppo. For, journeying thither, in company with the Rechabites, they refused to enter the city, but pitched their tents without the walls. Mr. Wolff remained with them. And during the night, a shock took place, which buried a great part of Aleppo, with some thousands of the inhabitants, in promiscuous ruin.

It were much to be wished, that an exact inquiry should be made, by our *British* residents in those parts, respecting the people here described. A more interesting subject of inquiry, it is not easy to conceive. According to the foregoing statement, while the house of Israel has wholly disappeared, and while the house of Judah has, for nearly eighteen hundred years, been dispersed abroad, as wanderers and outcasts, over every country of the known world, — the house of the Rechabites would appear to have remained undisturbed inhabitants of Arabia and Palestine, — a living witness against the disobedience of the chosen people, and a lasting memorial of that unchangeable word of the Lord, — “Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me FOR EVER!”



light, reflected upon the religion of Arabia in the days of Moses and Jethro, by the scriptural accounts just cited, respecting this insulated people.*

But, for proofs of the transmission to later times, of that patriarchal faith which *certainly* existed in Arabia in the Mosaic age, we ought to look, not without, but within, the peninsula.

And here, it might seem useless to expect light from Scripture, which touches little upon the history, and still less upon the religious belief, of the nations bordering on Palestine. It happens, however, that, in the instance of Arabia, Scripture *has* preserved two historical facts, very observable in themselves, and, on first view, apparently difficult of explanation; but which admit of being explained, in a perfectly satisfactory and consistent way, when once taken in connection with the earlier vestiges adduced above, of the patriarchal origin, and traditional preservation, of religion, among the ante-Mahometan Arabians. The former of those incidental facts is supplied by the Old, the latter by the New, Testament.

The earlier of the occurrences in question, is, the celebrated journey of the Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem; whither she went up "to hear the wisdom of Solomon." There has been some needless difference of opinion among the learned, about the country of this eastern princess. But, by a nearly unanimous consent, she has been rightly placed in the country of Yeman, the Arabia Felix of the classical writers. Her designation by our Lord, in the Gospel, as "the Queen of the South," had, in truth, determined the question of her native sphere of rule, long before it was agitated. For the inhabitants of Judæa invariably applied the phrase, "the South," as its proper name, when they spoke of that part of the Arabian peninsula, which lay to the southward of Pa-

* One important precept, common to the law of the Rechabites and to that of Mahomet, peculiarly claims attention; namely, the injunction to abstain from wine. The common origin of the reformation is discernible, in the corresponding prohibitions of the reformers.



lestine. The Queen of the South *, accordingly, is generally allowed to have reigned over the flourishing kingdom of Sheba, Saba, or Sabæa †; a region of the Happy Arabia, where, as foreign and native authorities agree in testifying, it was customary for women to inherit, and administer, the sovereign power. ‡

With reference to the scriptural account of her voyage to Jerusalem, however, *on any ordinary hypothesis*, the undertaking of this Arabian princess seems by no means easily accounted for. Suppose her, for example, to have been a heathen, wholly ignorant of the true God, and unacquainted, consequently, with the character of the wisdom of Solomon, or the inspiration from which it flowed,—and does it not appear most unlikely, that a female sovereign, living in a remote extremity of Arabia, should withdraw herself from the seat of government (always a critical step in eastern countries §); should abandon to others the care of her subjects; and should encounter, lastly, the hazards and hardships of a journey across the desert,—merely on learning the popular fame of the wisdom of the King of Israel, how-

* Her country will appear, on comparison of the scriptural account of her *presents*, with that given by Strabo of the *produce* of Sabæa: “And she gave the king an hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices very great store:—there came no more such abundance of spices, as the Queen of Sheba gave to King Solomon.” 1 Kings, x. 10. Compare App. i. p. 399. note (*).

† According to Patricides, the adopted country of Ishmael. Cf. Hott. H. O. p. 37.

‡ See Pocock. Spec. p. 60. “Saraceni ... mulieres aiunt in eos regnare.” Expos. totius mundi, p. 3. ap. Hudson, tom. iii. cf. Decline and Fall, vol. ix. p. 234. “Scilicet Reginam Austri, ad magnum Israëlitarum regem Salomonem venientem, ut sapientiam ejus audiret, non ex Meroë, quod ex Josepho contendit Grotius, sed ex Sabæa regione Arabiæ fuisse, facile summo viro Samueli Bocharto assentimur, recteque ei calculum alios viros doctissimos adjecisse concedimus.” Brucker, Hist. Crit. Philos. tom. i. pp. 215, 216.

§ Particularly in Yeman, where the law, as reported by Agatharcides, was, that the sovereign must not leave the palace,—μη εξεῖναι ἐκ τῶν βασιλείων. Decline and Fall, ut supr.



ever great and wide-spread the report of that wisdom might be?

But, let the visit of the Queen of Sheba be regarded under another aspect, let it be taken in connection with the proofs already indicated, of the introduction and transmission of the religion of Abraham, through different channels, among the Arab tribes; and her undertaking will appear at once natural and explicable, to every sincere believer in Revelation; for, on this supposition, it has a just and adequate motive. Since, worshipping, though with fainter lights, and lower opportunities, the same Almighty God whom Solomon worshipped,—and qualified, therefore, to apprehend and appreciate the wisdom which flowed from Him,—this Queen of the South might well desire, at whatever cost, to improve herself in the knowledge of divine truth, at the feet of the King of Israel. In a word, grant the Sabæan princess, like so many of her countrymen, to have known and cherished the first principles of the patriarchal faith, and the reasonableness and likelihood of her voyage to Jerusalem are equally clear. But she *did* make the journey: and this simple fact, by strict parity of reasoning, implies, both her knowledge of the religion, and her worship of the God, of Abraham. *

And thus, from the case of the Queen of the South, may be drawn a double confirmation of our present argument: for, while the preceding evidences of the continuous existence of the patriarchal belief in Arabia, on the one hand, satisfactorily explains her extraordinary enterprise; on the

* The whole inferences deduced above, from the probabilities of the case abstractedly considered, are supported by the Scripture narrative; which expressly assigns a *religious* motive for the Queen's journey, and which affirms, by implication, her acquaintance with the true God: "And when the Queen of Sheba heard of the fame of Solomon, concerning the name of the Lord, she came to prove him with hard questions. — And Solomon told her all her questions: there was not any thing hid from the King, which he told her not. And when the Queen of Sheba had seen all Solomon's wisdom, — she said to the king, It was a true report that I heard in mine own land, of thy acts, and of thy wisdom. — *Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighteth in thee, to set thee on the throne of Israel: because the Lord loved Israel for ever, therefore made he thee king, to do judgment and justice.*" 1 Kings, x. 1—9.



other hand, her progress to Jerusalem supplies a fresh independent proof, that at least the *substance* of the patriarchal religion still subsisted in the peninsula, in her day.

To pass, at this point of the evidence, from the Old Testament, to the New: the Gospel history, it is deserving of special notice, records a parallel journey from Arabia to Jerusalem, on a similar errand: "Now, when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men * from the East, to Jerusalem, saying, Where is He that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the East, and are come to worship him."

The native country of these wise men, or magi, has also been made the subject of learned discussion: although with little reason; excepting, indeed, as an agreeable exercise for the ingenuity of critical conjecture. For, in this memorable example, prophecy, and the general consent of Christian antiquity, combine with the geographical indications, and with the nature of the presents or offerings of these eastern sages, to fix their abode in Arabia.

David, in an express prediction of the advent of the Messiah, had foretold concerning it: "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of *Sheba* and *Seba* (or Arabia and Saba) shall *offer gifts*:" and again, "Unto him shall be *given of the gold of Sheba* (or Arabia)." † Isaiah, when speaking of the coming in of the Gentiles to Christ, does so, by enlarging and perfecting this prediction of the royal Psalmist: "The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah: *all they from Sheba shall come; they shall bring gold and incense*; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of *Kedar* shall be gathered together unto thee; the rams of *Nebaioth* shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory. — Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, *their silver and their gold with them*, unto the name of the Lord

* Gr. *magoi*.

† Ps. lxxii. 10. 15.



thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee.”*

This prophecy of Isaiah is a manifest repetition and expansion of that in the seventy-second Psalm; and it still more specifically directs our attention to Arabia, and the posterity of Ishmael, for both the primary, and the eventual, fulfilment of both predictions. But let us examine some circumstances in them a little more nearly, in connection with the Gospel narrative of the journey of the wise men from the East.

Arabia Deserta, it will be observed, is constantly expressed, in the idiom of the Old Testament, by the appellation of “the East,” or “the East Country.” Arabia Felix, fertile in *gold*, is the native soil of *incense*. And thus, the leading marks of the two prophecies meet together in the Gospel accounts of the magi: for these wise men “came from the East to Jerusalem;” they came thither to worship “the King’s Son,” that is, the infant Messiah, the newly-born “King of the Jews;” “and, when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; GOLD, and FRANK-INCENSE, and MYRRH.”†

The “magi” of the evangelists, are by the prophets entitled “kings;” and the designations are perfectly reconcilable, or rather consistent with one another. According to an ordinary acceptation of the title king, in the Old Testament, their *prophetical* designation was amply justified by the rank which, as the richness of their offerings bespeaks, they held, as Arabian *Emirs*; the only rank, indeed, among the Bedoweens, equivalent to that of king.

From what has been elsewhere remarked, respecting the wide-spread settlement of the Abrahamic family in the peninsula, the probability is obviously a high one, that these

* Isaiah, lx. 6—9.

† In the following passage of *S. Jerome* are happily united the Christian father and the Christian poet:—“Pulcherrime munerum sacramenta *Juwencus* presbyter uno versiculo comprehendit:

Tus, aurum, myrrham: regique, hominique, Deoque
Dona ferunt.”

Galland. Bibl. Vet. Patr. tom. iv. Proleg.



Arab chiefs were themselves of the race of Abraham. Epiphanius makes them descendants of the patriarch, by Keturah. But the main considerations in the Gospel narrative are, the confirmation which it gives to all the earlier tokens, of the continued existence, among the ancient Arabs, of vestiges of the true Abrahamic faith; and the providential connection which the fact there recorded serves to maintain, in the moment of our Lord's coming, between the respective families and covenants of Isaac and Ishmael. For here, in the persons of her wise men, we see Arabia, as had been foretold of her, coming in to the King Messiah as the first-fruits of the Gentiles; we see Ishmael, bowing down to Isaac, and bringing his lower covenant to pay homage and obeisance, at the feet of the Divine offspring and heir of the great covenant of promise. While this glad fulfilment of the prophecy of David, stands to us as a pledge and foretaste of the still more glorious accomplishment of the kindred prediction of Isaiah, which describes the tribes of Arabia, as ushering in the fulness of the Gentiles; and represents the general conversion of the seed of Ishmael, as among the last and greatest triumphs of the Gospel of Christ.

This scriptural view of the mission of these eastern sages, gives to the entire transaction a unity and consistency, every way becoming the majesty and wisdom of the Divine dealings; and which, upon any narrower hypothesis, might be sought after in vain. The extraordinary skill which the magi of the Gospel discovered, in the interpretation of the sign of the newly-risen star, may thus also be intelligibly accounted for. To unveil the mystery of this unparalleled phenomenon, the vain science of astrology*, so much in

* One most interesting application of this favourite Arabian science has been preserved by Selden. Speaking of the figures employed to personify the heavenly signs, he observes:—“Vultus autem illi cœlestes non modo xlviii. constellationes globis depictas, verum innumeras et portentosas etiam illas figuras denotant, quæ Persæ, Indi, atque Ægyptiî, cum unoquoque signi decano, seu quolibet decani gradu, ascendere tradebant:



use among the Arabs, could have been intrinsically of no avail. But, without having recourse, in the first instance, for a solution of the case, to the extreme alternative of an immediate inspiration*, the traditional lights already shown to have been preserved in the great Arabian family, will alone enable us to explain the seeming difficulty.

From their connecting the appearance of an unknown star, with the idea of kingly power, it seems manifest, that the tradition of the prophecy of Balaam, a prophecy originally delivered in Arabia, still survived in the peninsula, and was familiar to the wise men in the Gospel. But, if we pre-suppose, as there is so much reason to pre-suppose, a traditional acquaintance, on the part of these sages, with the promises and faith of Abraham, this prediction of Balaam,

quarum in numero est illa, quam in primo *Virginis* decano sphaerae Persicae collocant; *Virgo nempe pulchra*, capillitio prolixæ, duas spicas manu gestans, residens in siliquastro, *educans puerulum, lactans et cibans eum*.

“Pro exemplo hanc magis attuli, quod non solum ALBOASAR decanum illum uti cæleste unici Salvatoris Jesu nativitatis symbolum notaverit MAHUMMEDANUS; verum etiam insignis ille mathematicus, et vir ultra sane quam seculum suum tulit doctus, Rogerus Bachonus, Oxoniensis et Minorita, *Alboasaris sententiam fuerit amplexus*. Opere enim tertio, quod ad Clementem Quartum dedit, Alboasaris verba, ab Hermanno Dalmata Latine ex Arabico facta, citat, subjungitque: *Intentio est, quod beata Virgo habet figuram et imaginem infra decem primos gradus Virginis, et quod nata fuit quando Sol est in Virgine, et ita habetur signatum in Calendario, et quod nutriet Filium suum Christum Jesum in terra Hebræorum*.” De Diis Syris, Op. tom. iii. pp. 282, 283.

It is impossible to avoid connecting with this specimen of Arabian astrology, the accommodation to the peculiar studies of the magi in the Gospel, observable in the notification of our Lord's advent to them by the appearance of “His star in the East;” which heavenly sign, moreover, “went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was.” The correspondence of the prophetic symbol with their national science might be illustrated from the fact, that, in eastern astrology, the *Vultus cælestes* indicated similar *Vultus hujus seculi*. But the author is obliged, for his own satisfaction, to refer the whole occurrence to the tradition of the prophecy of Balaam, and to the concurrence of the unknown star, with the general expectation then prevalent among the Arabs.

* Subsequently, they *did* receive a warning from heaven, in a dream. See St. Matt. ii. 12.



when once fulfilled, must, from the *sensible* character of the fulfilment, have become its own interpreter. For, trained, by the first elements of the patriarchal faith, in the expectation of some great deliverer, the appearance of a strange star in the heavens would naturally awaken recollections of the promised star of Jacob, and would, as naturally, lead their thoughts and steps toward Judea, wherein the prediction of Balaam fore-warned them it should one day arise and shine; while the prophetic mention of the *sceptre of Israel*, might further instruct them, to seek in Judea a *regal* deliverer, even Him, who was "born King of the Jews."

We will now, in conclusion, briefly recapitulate the steps of the argument. 1. In the history of Job and his friends, the religion of Abraham and the patriarchs is to be seen in extraordinary vigour in Arabia, about, or prior to, the age of Moses. 2. In the scriptural accounts of Jethro, and of his descendants, the Kenites and Rechabites, the independent existence and transmission of that patriarchal faith can be continuously traced, from the time of Moses, to that of Jeremiah: since this Arab race, though living in Judea, preserved its national manners and usages unchanged, and dwelt, from the date of its first settlement to that of the Babylonish captivity, in a state of civil and religious separation from the Jews. 3. In the reign of Solomon, an incidental corroboration of both preceding testimonies arises, from the heart of Arabia, in the voyage of the Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem, to hear the inspired wisdom of the king. 4. The origin and object of whose journey may seem, in the last place, significantly illustrated and explained by another, and similar journey of Arabian sages, the magi or wise men of Saint Matthew's Gospel, to hail the promised advent of "one greater than Solomon,"—to pay their prophetic worship, and present their predicted offerings, to the infant Messiah.

But, over and above the witness which the foregoing scriptural relations bear to the primitive existence, and constant preservation, among the ancient Arabians, of a



religion deriving from patriarchal times, and from the Abrahamic creed, * — the subject-matter of those relations may fairly be accepted as no inconsiderable proof of the existence, also, of a designed connection between the *covenants*, as well as between the *families*, of Isaac and Ishmael. Inasmuch as the book of Job was incorporated, from the beginning, into the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures; and the examples, of this Arabian patriarch, of the family of Jethro, and of the Queen of the South, are cited, both in the Old Testament and in the Gospel, for the special religious encouragement, or warning, of God's chosen people.

The force of these several testimonies, taken independently of each other, would, probably, be admitted by candid reasoners, as by no means inconsiderable. But it becomes, as all must allow, materially augmented, when viewed, as it ought to be viewed, in connection with other historical vouchers, previously adduced, in elucidation of the Abrahamic origin of the religious belief which obtained in ante-Mahometan Arabia: namely, the rite of circumcision, as nationally practised by the Arabs, in the time of Josephus, in commemoration of the circumcision of Ishmael, their father; the legible marks of patriarchal and Abrahamic traditions, engraven on the decorations, and embodied with the solemnities, of the Caaba; and the popular belief in the great doctrine of one God, still practically existing among the pagan tribes of the peninsula, in the time of Mahomet.

* “ Arabes necessariò de proto-parentis sui religione antiquitùs *proculdubio* aliquid inaudiverint, eaque illis innotuerit.” Hyde, *Hist. Vet. Relig. Pers.* p. 33. cf. p. 35.



No. III.

CRITICAL REMARKS ON THE SEVERAL APPLICATIONS OF
THE PROPHECY, DAN. VIII. 9—25.

THE prediction in the book of Daniel, concerning the little horn of the he-goat, or Macedonian empire, has been successively applied to Antiochus Epiphanes, to the Romans, and to Mahomet or Mahometanism.* The ancients generally, and some eminent names among modern commentators, have understood this prophecy of Antiochus. His individual claims, however, to be the power here symbolized, seem satisfactorily disproved by those interpreters, who contend, with far stronger grounds of reason, for its application to the Romans. More recent writers on Prophecy conceive the little horn to be properly applicable to Mahometanism, and to Mahometanism alone.

In the second section of the present work, the author submitted his reasons for concurring in the last of these opinions. But, to avoid breaking the thread of the general argument, he there confined himself to an examination of the proofs, which seem to identify the Mahometan apostasy with the Macedonian, or Eastern, little-horn.

In adopting the interpretation first advanced by Mr. Whitaker, it is due, however, to the high authorities from which he is obliged to dissent, and it may, perhaps, contribute further confirmation to his own side of the question, briefly to discuss the *relative* merits of the views taken of this pro-

* The patriarch Sophronius saw, in the capture of Jerusalem by the Saracens, the fulfilment of the prediction of Daniel, referred to by our Lord, St. Matt. xxiv. 15. See Ockley, v. i. p. 216. with his confirmative remarks, p. 225.

phesy: an inquiry which shall form the subject of the following remarks.

Of the three hypotheses above mentioned, each is attended by its difficulties. But the objections to the first, which makes Antiochus Epiphanes the little horn of the he-goat, appear to be insurmountable. And the arguments brought against this theory by Sir Isaac, and by Bishop, Newton, may be fairly pronounced conclusive; for the pretensions of Antiochus seem now generally given up.

By these eminent expositors, this part of Daniel's vision is transferred, from the Syrian tyrant, to his conquerors, the Romans. And, understood in its literal sense, it certainly presents a large and close affinity of character to pagan Rome. At the same time, this interpretation has difficulties on the face of it not to be concealed; and these very serious ones. 1. Bishop Newton and Sir Isaac agree in recognizing the little horn as the symbol of an *anti-christian* power.* But neither Antiochus, nor the Romans, were, properly, anti-christian powers; nor can they be termed types of Antichrist, in any other than a loose and figurative sense. However, therefore, they may have shadowed forth that power, they could not, either of them, *be* the power symbolized by the little horn. 2. Pagan Rome was not a portion of the Macedonian empire; and cannot be directly identified with a power, which the prophecy describes as coming forth out of that empire.† 3. Neither does it, in any just sense, answer the type of a *little* horn. On the contrary, at the period

* Saint Jerome has recorded this, as the judgment also of the ancients: "Hunc locum plerique nostrorum ad *Antichristum* referunt: et quod sub Antiocho in *typo* factum est, sub illo [*Antichristo*] in veritate dicunt esse complendum." Hieron. in locum. Col. 1106. Edit. Benedict. ap. Bp. Newton, Diss. xv. But modern Christian writers unite to designate Mahomet — *ipsum antichristum orientalem*.

† Especially as the Romans never made Macedon a seat of empire, but merely subdued, and incorporated it in the province of Greece. They never, consequently, appeared there in the character of a horn, or *kingdom*, of the subdivided Greek empire.



of its first irruption, through Macedon, into the East, the Roman power was a great and notable horn *; and the attempts to prove it a little one, undertaken in support of a favourite hypothesis, are altogether gratuitous and puerile.† But, that the parallel should thus fail at the outset, — that there should be a want of correspondence with the symbol which is the groundwork of the prophecy, — is a first objection to the interpretation, little short of fatal.

The principal objections to understanding this prophecy of Mahometanism are, 1. that this apostasy had its rise without the confines of the empire of Alexander; and, 2. that, unlike the Roman power which was contemporary with them, it did not spring up until nearly seven hundred years after the four notable horns of the vision, or the four kingdoms of the Macedonian empire, had ceased to exist as kingdoms.

To the former of these objections, it has been answered ‡, that the district of Arabia which gave birth to Mahomet has been reckoned, both by ancient and modern geographers, to form a part of the Greek empire, and of the Ptolemean

* “Post Carthaginem, vinci *neminem* puduit.” Florus, l. ii. c. 7. Such is the true picture of the conquering majesty of Rome, at her first appearance on the theatre of the Macedonian empire. The spirit of hypothesis alone could identify a power like this, with the type of a *little* horn. In many respects, the resemblances to the prophecy are very strong; but it seems vain to seek one here, — there is here *no* likeness.

† The learned Dr. Zouch, for example, contends that Rome answers the symbol, from the *weakness* of her power on her first appearance in the East. If there be any thing in the argument, the Roman power, as the little horn of the he-goat, must have been weak, in comparison with that of each of the four notable horns. And how was this relative weakness first manifested? Immediately after the *conquest* of Macedonia, one of the four horns, a *message* from the Roman senate decided the fate of two of the remaining notable horns. Rome saved Egypt, and scared Syria, by a word! It seems unaccountable how any interpreters could shut their eyes to the incongruity, between the power said to be symbolized, and the symbol. The fact would appear to be, that, misled by the other circumstantial agreements with the prophecy, the commentators would not, or could not, keep in mind the insurmountable nature of this first difficulty.

‡ Sect. ii. vol. i. pp. 176, 177.



kingdom of Egypt : while, even were this not so, Mahometanism would still stand on an equal footing with Rome ; — both powers having become alike engrafted on the empire of the he-goat, the one by the conquest of Macedon, and the other by the capture of Syria* ; — two of the four kingdoms of the dismembered he-goat. And, as there is no third claimant, the objection fairly falls to the ground.

To the second objection it has been replied †, that, however commentators have been misled into the supposition, the book of Daniel supplies no ground for inferring, that the existence of the four prophetic horns was to cease with the passing away of their kingdoms. Indeed, the sacred text suggests a directly opposite inference : for we are *not* told, on the one hand, that the four notable horns were broken ; and we *are* told, on the other hand, that three of the beasts in the preceding chapter, including the Macedonian leopard, with his *four heads*, being the same with the *four horns*, “ had their *dominion* taken away, yet their *LIVES* were prolonged for a season and a time.” ‡

The bodies of the beasts, then, may be conceived to represent the bodies, or geographical boundaries, of the primitive empires symbolized ; and the horns, to typify the various powers successively ruling over, or within, these bodies. Thus contemplated, the Macedonian empire, after its dominion has been taken away, still lives on, in the eye of prophecy, as the body of the he-goat. And the same pro-

* The Saracens effected in Syria, what the Romans did not effect in Macedon : they restored a kingdom there ; making Damascus the seat of their empire. In this capital, the dynasty of the Omniades flourished during eleven successive reigns : Cufa, their second imperial seat, was also situated in Syria : and Bagdad, the capital of the Abbasside dynasty, built at the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates, also stood within the kingdom of the Seleucidæ.

† Sect. ii. vol. i. pp. 174, 175.

‡ From comparison of Dan. vii. 11. and vii. 12. it would seem clear, that the lives of the other beasts were preserved *after the slaying and burning of the fourth beast*. The three were in fact geographically one : the Assyrian, the Persian, and the Macedonian monarchies in the East, being nearly conterminous.



longation of existence may, on similar ground, be extended from the body, to the four notable horns, or kingdoms, of the he-goat; out of one of which, the little horn of the vision was to spring up. For the four horns, as exercising dominion over the four quarters of the body, may rightly be understood to represent the whole body of the goat, or the permanently surviving carcase of the Macedonian empire. Now, not only has Daniel omitted to mention that these horns were broken, but, by his silence, he leads us to infer that they were not broken; since of the two other horns noticed in this prophecy, he has positively stated, that the first great horn was broken, and that the little horn shall be broken.* The distinction thus indicated, is accurately preserved in the context. In the eighth verse we read: "The great horn was broken; and *for* (i. e. *in place of*) it, came up four notable horns." No mention is made of these horns being broken; and, accordingly, in the ninth verse, we are told: "And *out of* one of them (i. e. not, instead of, but branching up from, one of them) came forth a little horn."

But the symbols themselves permanently existing, it was evidently matter of no moment, at what period the power symbolized by the little horn should arise. Mahometanism, in the seventh century of the Christian era, as aptly complies with the chronology of the prediction, as Antiochus Epiphanes himself, or as Rome in his days.

The apparent difficulties objected to this application of it once removed, in every other respect, the type of the little horn of the he-goat will be found to agree with the Mahometan apostasy, uniformly well, and often far more appro-

* "But he shall be broken without hand." Dan. viii. 25. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image.— And the stone, that smote the image, became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." Dan. ii. 34, 35. The same consummation is predicted in both prophecies. May we not infer, that the little horn, or king of fierce countenance, which shall be broken without hand, is to be broken by the stone cut out without hands? This similarity of expression apparently marks the unity of the predictions.



privately than with pagan Rome. The littleness of its beginnings; the rapidity of its growth, and the vastness of its expansion, in the directions foretold; the genuineness of its anti-christian character; the clearness of its correspondence with the terms employed throughout the prophecy, which are chiefly borrowed from the Jewish ritual, and manifestly designed to describe a spiritual tyranny; the strong resemblance, lastly, between the prophetic descriptions of the two little horns*, coupled with the no less perfect similarity, in fact, subsisting between Mahometanism and the papacy;—these features together, identify the Mahometan apostasy with the power of the eastern little horn, at once with a minuteness and a comprehensiveness, which, in any application of the type to the Romans, would be sought after in vain.

If to this comparative estimate of the pretensions of pagan Rome, and of those of Mahometanism, to be the power typified by the little horn of the he-goat, an observation or two be added, on the chronology of the whole vision, Dan. viii., and on the marks which it apparently contains of time and continuance—it is hoped that enough may have been done to justify the interpretation of that prophecy, adopted in the second section of this work.

With respect to the time specified in the vision, it is

* Dr. Zouch has ably argued the appropriateness of the symbol of a little horn, Dan. vii., in its application to the pope: "The little horn, which arose after, or behind, the other horns (that is, in a *secret and unperceived* manner, the other sovereigns of the earth not discovering the exercise of his dominion until he became superior to them,) aptly delineates the person of the pope, who, in his beginning *feeble and unimportant*, acquired by degrees an uncontrolled authority. His power was diverse from the others, displaying itself in a manner *totally unknown before*, by assuming a *spiritual, as well as temporal, jurisdiction over the affairs of men.*" Zouch on Dan. vii. 8. Drop the name of the pope from this context; and so appropriate is the description to *both* little horns, that it would seem impossible to determine, whether the passage was written as a comment on Dan. vii. 8., or on Dan. viii. 9.: a fresh proof of the designed parallel between these predictions.



almost needless to expose the inconsistency of attempting, as some few commentators have attempted, to explain the "days" of Daniel, as natural days. The notion is refuted on every side, both by the chronology of Daniel's other visions, and by the corresponding period of Saint John, in the Apocalypse; and it owed its origin, too obviously, to the determination of certain expositors, to fit the prophecy to the person of Antiochus, and restrict it to his persecution. An end which, after all, the expedient wholly fails to answer.

Concluding, therefore, with the general consent of interpreters, the "days" of Daniel's prophecies to be days of years, we will try, by the chronology of the vision at large, our application of the type of the little horn.

Daniel, viii. 3—14. contains the vision: which very fully portrays the distinct, and successive powers, of the ram, the he-goat, the four notable horns, and the little horn. It is particularly observable in this vision, that the description of the little horn, or the power last named, is much fuller than those of the preceding powers; and that the description further contains indications, that this horn, like the little horn mentioned in the seventh chapter, was to be a power diverse from its predecessors. The entire period of the vision, it appears, was to be two thousand and three hundred prophetic days.

When the prophet had seen the vision, he sought to know the meaning. Gabriel is commanded to interpret it. The angel begins with the chronology; and informs Daniel, that "*the vision shall be at the time of the end.*" The time of the end, therefore, includes the whole period of the vision, or two thousand and three hundred days. As Gabriel proceeds with the interpretation, there occurs a further limitation of "the time of the end:" "And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in *the last end* of the indignation." This fresh limit in point of time, taken in connection with the marked distinctness of the concluding prophecy of the vision, from the other parts, appears to intimate, that the interpretation itself was mainly to relate to *the latter part of*



the vision; in other words, to the prophecy of the little horn.

Daniel, viii. 20—25. contains the interpretation; which accurately tallies with the previous intimation alluded to, of a further limit being placed on the entire period of the vision, or “the time of the end.”

“The *last* end of the indignation,” is what the angelic interpreter professes to make known; and, accordingly, the *last* prophecy of the vision is that which the interpretation, in fact, enlarges on in its details. V. 20., the kingdom of the Medes and Persians is barely mentioned and dismissed; v. 21., the empire of Alexander, and v. 22., the four kingdoms of his successors experience the same slight and cursory notice. And their introduction into the interpretation has all the air of being merely prefatory to the full explanation of the remaining symbol, the little horn; a full and minute delineation of which, under the character of “a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences,” occupies the sequel of the interpretation, from the twenty-second verse, to the twenty-sixth. Whence we may legitimately infer, that “the last end of the indignation,” the period which the angel undertakes to “make known,” synchronizes with the power of the little horn, and is designed to mark out *its* appointed term.

But dating, as justice to the order and completeness of its predictions should lead us to date, the commencement of the vision, somewhere during the time of its earliest symbol the ram; during the existence, that is, of the Persian empire; we are conducted, for *the first rise* of the power of the little horn, to a time *certainly* posterior, both to Antiochus Epiphanes, and to the Romans in the age of Vespasian,—or the final destruction of Jerusalem. For when, from the entire period of the vision, that is, from “the time of the end,” or the two thousand three hundred prophetic days, we deduct the included period of “the last end of the indignation,” or the twelve hundred and sixty prophetic days, the complement will be a thousand and forty prophetic days, or natural



years. Now, to compute from the earliest date allowed of by the limits of the vision, if we reckon the two thousand and three hundred years of Daniel to commence at the first erection, by Cyrus, of the kingdom of the Medes and Persians, the computation will place their commencement only so far back, as the year before Christ five hundred and thirty-eight. But one thousand and forty years, being the complement of the whole period after deducting twelve hundred and sixty years, on this calculation brings us at once down to the year of our Lord five hundred and two, for the date of the rise of the little horn; that is to say, not only to a period long subsequent to the supposed fulfilment of this last prophecy by the Romans, but even to the time when the Roman empire had become Christian.

Such will be the result, if we are to throw back the commencement of the two thousand and three hundred days to the earliest admissible period, the foundation of the Persian empire. Commentators are, however, agreed that there is a latitude of choice open to us, for the fixing of this date; which the purport of the vision only requires to be placed some time during the existence of the ram, or of the empire of Cyrus. The choice of the time of commencement will depend, therefore, on collateral circumstances.

For these circumstances, we may turn to the eleventh and twelfth chapters of Daniel; which Sir Isaac Newton has pronounced to be a commentary on the prophecy of the little horn. Now, Dan. xi. 40. appears to fix the beginning of this last-named period, —for it is there stated, that, “at the time of the end, shall the King of the South push at him;” and its progress, for it is added, “and the King of the North shall come against him like a whirlwind;” and Dan. xii. 6, 7. seems to specify its whole duration, and its close, for there we read, “the end of these wonders shall be for *a time, times, and an half*; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished.”

But we have already remarked * that both Sir Isaac and

* Sect. ii.



Bishop Newton interpret the predictions concerning the Kings of the South and North, of the Saracens and Turks. And the author only follows up *their* premises, in understanding the prophecy of the little horn, on which these predictions are a comment, of Mahometanism.

It only remains to be examined, how far the rise of the Mahometan apostasy accords with the chronology of the vision in the eighth chapter. Mahometanism arose in the seventh century of the Christian era : a date most remarkable, in a variety of aspects. It coincides exactly with the rise of a parallel prophetic symbol, the little horn of the ten kingdoms, or the apostasy of papal Rome. If we compute backward a thousand and forty years, it places us in the flourishing era of the Persian empire. If we reckon forward twelve hundred and sixty years, the computation synchronizes with a cognate prophetic period, with that assigned for the duration of the former, or western, little horn : while it is sustained by the whole parallel characters and history of Popery and Mahometanism.

To sum up the preceding remarks in a few words. The chronology, which, on any computation, appears to exclude the Romans * from ranking, at least in its principal sense, as the power predicted by the type of the little horn, is, on the contrary, found accurately to tally with the rise and progress of Islamism. The internal evidence of this prophecy unites with wholly undesigned testimonies, furnished by

* The inadequacy of this interpretation needs nothing more for its exposure, than a little reflection on the expedients to which Bp. Newton is driven, in order to make out a case at all. First, *pagan* Rome is made the little horn of the he-goat, as a type of antichrist, and in virtue of its having become, by the conquest of Macedon, a member of the Greek empire. Then, we have *papal* Rome, as *eastern* antichrist, succeeding to it, in the character of the *Macedonian* little horn, — which had *no* connection whatever with the East, or with Macedon. The interpreter essays to slide from the one ground to the other; wholly unconscious that the brittle support of his argument is gone from under him. The transition is necessarily resorted to, in order to eke out the prophetic period.



leading interpreters, to identify that spiritual tyranny with the prophetic type. Its past correspondence with a kindred tyranny, also foretold under a like symbol, strengthens the application. And the symptoms of coincidence, in the approaching fall of both powers symbolized, seem to corroborate, in the way most to be desired, this sense of the prophecy.

It may be noticed, as additionally supporting this view of Dan. viii. 9—25., or the prophecy of the little horn of the he-goat, that the conclusion respecting it, first broached by Mr. Whitaker, has been arrived at, in these remarks, and in the section to which they are appended, by a wholly different mode of proof.

In thus regarding the Mahometan tyranny, as the power eminently prefigured by the type of the Macedonian little horn, it is far from the author's intention to infer, that it is the power exclusively prefigured. The fundamental rule of a germinant interpretation will authorize and suggest a far broader conclusion. The belief of the ancient church, both Jewish and Christian, that this prediction has relation to Antiochus *, and of so many Christian expositors, that it belongs to the Romans, may, in this more comprehensive aspect of prophecy, not be destitute of foundation. And that germinant character of the prophetic Scriptures, so strikingly exemplified in the grand prediction, St. Matth. xxiv., which includes, in one view, the impending fall of Jerusalem, and the most distant fortunes of the church of Christ, will admit of the successive application, in degrees less and more perfect, of the prediction here in question, to Antiochus, to pagan Rome, and to Mahometanism.

* For the belief of the Jewish church, Bp. Newton and others have cited the testimony of Josephus, l. x. c. xi. § 7. It is surprising that interpreters should not have more strongly noticed the clear reference of this prophecy to Antiochus Epiphanes, by the author of the first book of Maccabees. See 1. Maccab. i. passim. The allusions in vv. 10. and 30. are peculiarly marked. It seems not to be doubted that the writer had Dan. viii. 9—25. in his eye.

The following tabular exhibition may enable the reader to draw his own conclusions, as to the intrinsic, and the relative, appropriateness of the three interpretations :—

DANIEL, VIII.	ANTIOCHUS EP.	ROMANS.	MAHOMETANISM.
9. And out of one of them (the four notable horns) came forth a little horn,	[Did <i>not</i> so come forth; but was himself one of the four notable horns.]	Can be said to have so come forth, only in virtue of their conquest of Macedon.	Did so come forth, both by its rise in the Hejaz, and by its early conquest of Syria.
which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land.	[Not so: he scarcely made any conquests; and became, in the end, exceeding little.]	Waxed exceeding great, in the geographical directions of the prophecy.	Waxed exceeding great, in the geographical directions of the prophecy.
10. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them.	So waxed great, by persecution of the Jewish priesthood, and of "the holy people."	So waxed great, by the utter destruction of the holy city, temple, priesthood, and people, of the Jews.	So waxed great, by the destruction of Christian churches, and persecution of Christian priesthood and people.
11. Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host; and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away; and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.	So magnified himself, by sacrilege, and impious insults of Jehovah. So literally took away the Jewish sacrifices.	So magnified themselves, by the judgment and crucifixion of our Lord. So literally took away the Jewish sacrifices. Fulfilled by, in the final destruction of the temple.	So magnified itself, by making Mahomet a greater prophet than Christ. So figuratively, by the destruction of Christian altars. Fulfilled by, in unparalleled destruction of Christian temples.
12. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice, by reason of transgression,			Fulfilled by substitution of Mahometan, for Christian, priesthood,—of the host of the little horn, for "the host of heaven;" by reason of sins of eastern church.
and <i>it</i> cast down the truth to the ground;			Fulfilled, by proselyting and persecuting zeal of the whole Mussulman priesthood and people; and, by prosperity of religion keeping pace with that of empire.
and <i>it</i> practised and prospered.			

DANIEL, VIII.	ANTIOCHUS EP.	ROMANS.	MAROMETANISM.
23. A king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences,	A king of fierce countenance in acts.	A republic. "A nation * of fierce countenance." Deut. xxviii. 50. Augury their favourite study.	A kingdom of fierce countenance, as a <i>destroying</i> apostasy. So Mahomet, as author of the Koran, and pretended interpreter of the mysteries of futurity.
shall stand up, — in the latter time of their kingdom.		So stood up, with great chronological exactness.	So stood up, but at a much later period.
24. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power :		[Not applicable to : they fought their own way, from the possession of one city, to the empire of the world.]	Eminently applies to : for it prevailed by the power of the host given to its king : i. e. through the spirit of fanaticism which infected all the conquered nations.
and he shall destroy wonderfully,	[Destroyed ; but partially.]	So destroyed, temporally.	So destroyed, temporally and spiritually.
and shall prosper and practise,	[Not fulfilled in.]	Did prosper and practise.	Did prosper and practise.
and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people.	[Persecuted, but failed to destroy.]	Destroyed the polity and nation of the Jews.	Destroyed the polity of eastern, and wasted universal Christendom.
25. And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand ; and he shall magnify himself in his heart ; and by peace shall destroy many :	[Remarkable enough for low cunning ; but did not prosper by his schemes.] [So most eastern despots.]	Remarkable for political skill ; and for the fruits reaped by their policy.	Its treaties only for <i>truces</i> , to be broken when advantageous to infringe them.
he shall stand up also against the Prince of princes ; but he shall be broken without hand.	Subdued by a message from the Roman senate.	In combats of gladiators. Stood up against, and crucified our Lord. [Not broken without hand, but by the strong hand of the barbarians of the North.]	In times of peace, remarkable for the fatal success of its schemes for perversion of Christians. Crucified the son of God afresh, in its character as an antichristian apostasy. Its time not yet accomplished ; manner of end, consequently, unknown.

* "A nation," not a king. The distinction should be attended to ; for the language of Scripture, even in its most mysterious prophecies, is always minutely accurate. So Dan. ix. 26. "And the people of the prince that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary;" con-

In this table, the evidences for the fulfilment of the prophecy by Antiochus, and by the Romans *, are taken from the standard commentators: for the marks of its fulfilment by Mahometanism, the author is himself partly responsible. It is left with others to decide, which of the three powers appears to supply the fullest accomplishment.

formably with the very letter of this prediction, history records that Titus used the greatest efforts to save the temple; but the infuriated soldiery fired it before his eyes, regardless of threats and intreaties.

* Each attempt of the commentators to appropriate this prediction to pagan Rome, seems worded, as it were, to establish its proper application to Mahometanism. To reconcile it to the Romans, Bishop Newton observes: "Their actions within the dominions of the goat, and not their affairs in the western empire, are the principal subject of this prophecy. But their actions, which are most largely and particularly specified, are their great persecution and oppression of the people of God: which renders it probable, that the appellation of *the little horn* might be given them for the same reason, that the great persecutor and oppressor of the saints in the western empire is also called *the little horn*. IT IS THE SAME KIND OF POWER, AND THEREFORE MIGHT BE SIGNIFIED BY THE SAME NAME." Diss. xv.

The similarity of the two symbols naturally implies the similarity of the two powers symbolized: —but how constrained and imperfect the Bishop's parallel, as applied to pagan Rome and popery? while, on the other hand, transfer but the application to popery and Islamism, and the parallel is full, natural, and perfect. They are truly and indeed "the same kind of power, and therefore might be signified by the same name."



No. IV.

PROOFS OF THE IDENTITY OF THE CRUSADES WITH
DANIEL'S "TIDINGS OUT OF THE NORTH."

IN the passage of the present work (Vol. I. pp. 202—204.), which the following observations are designed to illustrate, the crusades have been indicated as the prophetic "tidings out of the North," spoken of by Daniel, xi. 44., which should trouble, or impede, "the king of the North:" that is, which should arrest, for a season, the victorious career of the Turkish power.

The evidences, both geographical and historical, which support this interpretation, and which might have been out of place in the body of the work, are too important, and too interesting, to be omitted in the Appendix. A short review of these evidences shall form, therefore, its concluding Number.

1. To begin with the geographical proofs: Europe, as situated to the *north-west* of Asia, may be taken, in a general sense, to answer the prophetic description of "the North." But, added to the geographical position of the continent at large, there arises, in the next place, the further consideration, that the crusading armies were chiefly levied in the *north*, or *north-west*, of Europe: Germany, England, the Netherlands, and the north of France, may be said to have furnished the main strength and flower of those armies, from



the age of Godfrey of Bouillon to that of our first Edward. And, as it was from the northward that the main battle of the crusaders began its march, so, from a north-western direction, that march conducted it across the European continent and the Danube, into Illyricum and Thrace, countries even then overrun by the Turks*, and which now compose the north of modern Turkey.

Again, on passing into Asia, the Latin powers made their entrance through the northern, or north-western, frontier of the Turkish kingdom of Roum; and advancing thence, traversed Asia Minor from the northward, towards the goal of their great enterprize, Syria and the Holy Land.

And thus, in whatever aspect we contemplate the crusades, whether as to the countries whence they chiefly emanated, or the directions which they commonly took, the *geography* of these vast expeditions will still be found most accurately to correspond with the words of Daniel's prophecy: — “ And tidings out of the North shall trouble him.”

2. But a not less perfect fulfilment of this prediction is to be found in the *history* of the holy wars; or rather in that of the previous colonization and settlement of Europe.

During a course of centuries preceding the crusades, Europe had been inundated by the ceaseless stream of barbarian emigration from the regions of the North. By the incessant influx, both continent and islands were first depopulated, and then re-peopled. And while, by land, the Vandals, the Goths, the Visigoths, the Huns, the Heruli, and the Franks, converted the European continent into one great northern colony†; by sea, the Saxons, and the Danes,

* See Vol. II. p. 149.

† “ Des débris de l'empire Romain d'Occident, s'étaient formées, sur le sol de l'Europe, une foule de dominations, à la tête desquelles étaient, pour la plupart, les chefs de ces peuplades du Nord, qui avaient renversé l'empire.” M. C. Villers, *Essai sur la Réform. de Luth.* p. 42. A Paris, 1820. “ Les peuples du Nord, comme les Saxons, les Suisses, les Hollandais, les Anglais,” &c. *Ib.* p. 122.



poured into the islands in numbers sufficient to sweep away, and to replace, the ancient inhabitants.

So far as respected the character and origin of its population, therefore, any movement from our quarter of the globe might, as early as the commencement of the ninth century, be appropriately indicated in prophecy as "tidings out of the North." For, in the language of prophecy, change of seat by no means implied a change of national designation. Accordingly, in the same prophet Daniel, we find the Turkish power, long subsequent to its establishment in the lesser Asia, retaining its primitive appellation of "The King of the North."

But, towards the middle of the ninth century, there began a new northern emigration, which quickly overspread the European coasts and islands; which extended its ravages to the remotest extremities of the West*; but which erected, within the space of little more than one hundred years, potent monarchies and principalities, in the north, and south, and east of Europe. Too well known by their heroic deeds, it is almost needless to name the NORMANS; were it not that their name immediately connects them with the terms of Daniel's prediction; as do their chivalrous actions, with the whole history of the crusades.†

Nursed in the arms of victory, animated by the spirit of successful adventure, and impelled by devoted fidelity to the service of the church, this race of conquerors, at that time but recently emerged "from the snows of Scandinavia," flew

* See Vol. II. p. 194.

† "The powerful succour," says Mr. Gibbon, speaking of the third crusade, "of Flanders, Frise, and Denmark, filled near a hundred vessels; and the northern warriors were distinguished in the field by a lofty stature, and a ponderous battle-axe." *Decline and Fall*, vol. xi. ch. lix. p. 142. The historian verifies his text, by the following striking testimony of an anonymous chronicler: "*Northmanni et Gothi, et cæteri populi insularum, quæ inter occidentem et septentrionem sitæ sunt, gentes bellicosæ, corporis proceri, mortis intrepidæ, bipennibus armatæ, navibus rotundis, quæ Ysnachiæ dicuntur, advectæ.*"

to arms from all quarters, at the first summons of the Roman Pontiff, to form the van-guard of the first, as they composed the flower of each succeeding, crusade. Carrying into the East, in their very name, the interpretation of "tidings out of the North," the Normans of Italy and Sicily, of France and of England, early acquired, and throughout maintained, the pre-eminence among the champions of the holy wars. The achievements of Tancred, of Bohemond*, of Robert Duke of Normandy, and last and greatest, the unrivalled deeds of Richard Cœur de Lion, identify, not only by the testimony of their friends, but by the confession of their terrified enemies, the prowess of the Norman crusaders, with the tidings out of the North, which should trouble the King of the North.†

* "It is in the person of this *Norman* chief, that we may seek for the coolest policy and ambition, with a small alloy of religious fanaticism. His conduct may justify a belief, *that he had secretly directed the design of the pope*, which he affected to second with astonishment and zeal: at the siege of Amalphi, his example and discourse inflamed the passions of a confederate army; he instantly tore his garment to supply crosses for the numerous candidates; and prepared to visit Constantinople and Asia, at the head of ten thousand horse, and twenty thousand foot." Decline and Fall, vol. xi. p. 35.

† The terror, flight, and miserable end of Bagi Seian, the *Seljukian* prince of Antioch, who, on the approach of the crusaders, fell literally a victim to his own fears, — as described by Abulfeda, — form a wonderful commentary on this prediction of Daniel. "Anno ccccxix, [qui die 8. Dec. A. C. 1097 cœpit] commemoranda venit Francorum in Syriam invasio, per quam, inter ceteras ejus urbes, præcipuam ceperant Antiochiam. — Quæ oppressio Bagi Seianum, Turcomanum, ejus urbis tum dominum, — adeo terrebat, ut inops consilii trepidusque [Arab. هاربا

مرعوبا] quasi rebus jam conclamatis, de nocte aufugeret. Altero autem mane, sibi jam redditus, discusso terrore, singulaque secum per otium reputans, deplorabat miseram sortem [Arab. يا لهفي i. e. يتلهف dixit] liberorum suorum, et familiæ, et Muslemorum; quos in urbe relictos hosti permiserat. Quæ tristis recordatio tanta eum percellerat doloris vehementia, ut animo delinquens equo decideret. Fugæ quidem comites eum allevare tentabant in equum; sed viribus omnino exsolutus inhaerere jumento non valebat: quapropter eum, sibi consulentes, prostratum relin-

In support of this application of the prophécý, it may be stated, respecting the first crusade, that the passage for the army of Godfrey through the Lesser Asia (the seat of the Turkish power) was *first* opened by the sword of *Tancred*, and by his capture of the fortified cities of Tarsus and Malmistra; that the iron bridge over the Orontes, the natural defence of Antioch, was forced by *Robert Duke of Normandy*, whose success unbarred for the crusaders the single avenue of admission; that the French and *Norman* princes headed the nocturnal assault, and *first* mounted the walls of the metropolis of Syria; and that, in the moment of final triumph, the standard of the cross was *first* planted on the walls of Jerusalem itself, by the arm of the heroic *TANCRED*.

The details of these striking facts, the author prefers submitting in the words of Mr. Gibbon, rather than in his own. On the field of Dorylæum, "the fainting fight," says the historian of the empire, "was sustained by the personal valour of Bohemond, Tancred, and Robert of Normandy. — The Norman standard was first planted on the walls of Tarsus and Malmistra. — The capital of Syria was protected by the river Orontes; and the *iron bridge*, of nine arches, derives its name from the massy gates of the two towers, which are constructed at either end. They were opened by the sword of the Duke of Normandy: his victory gave entrance to three hundred thousand crusaders. — The nocturnal surprise (of Antioch) was executed by the French and Norman princes, who ascended in person the scaling ladders that were thrown from the walls. — In the pillage of public and private wealth (which ensued on the sack of Jerusalem), the adventurers had agreed to respect the exclusive property of the *first occupant*; and the spoils of the great mosque, seventy lamps, and massy vessels, of gold and silver, re-

quebant. Itaque jacenti Bagi Seiano, et animam agenti, amputabat prætereuns aliquis Armenus lignator caput, et ad Francos Antiochiam deferbat. Annal. Muslem. tom. iii. pp. 314—317. edit. Reisk.

* Decline and Fall, ch. lix.



warded the diligence, and displayed the generosity, of Tancred." *

A more important prize, the principality of Antioch, fell to the share of the interested and ambitious Bohemond. — Founded by the address of this politic chieftain, and maintained by his own valour, and that of his kinsman the Marquis of Montserrat, the *Norman* principality of Antioch became, indeed, "a bit in the mouth, and a hook in the nostrils," of the prophetic horsemen of the Apocalypse: it was immediately by *this* Latin power, that the Turks were held again, bound within the line of the Euphrates, during a period of one hundred and seventy years: an historical fact, which, in a permanent and peculiar sense, appropriates to the *Normans* a leading part in the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy, "and tidings out of the North shall trouble him." †

The rank in the Christian host allotted, by the judgment of the Turks and Saracens themselves, to the prince of Antioch, supplies no inconsiderable confirmation of this view. "In the caliph Mostali's estimate of their merit, or their power," Mr. Gibbon tells us, "*the first place* was assigned to *Bohemond*, and the second to *Godfrey*."

"And tidings out of the North shall trouble him. ‡" We

* Decline and Fall, ch. lix.

† For the sore thorn in their side which the Christian state at Antioch proved to the Turks, compare Abulfeda, ut supr. tom. iii. pp. 370—373. 386, 387.

‡ The annals of Abulfeda are copious upon the similar trouble experienced by the Turkish powers from the prophetic "tidings out of the East," or the irruption of the Tartars. See Abulfeda, tom. iv. v. passim; but especially iv. p. 296, 297., where the sufferings of the Mussulmans from the Moguls are represented as far surpassing those of the Jews, under the rod of Nebuchadnezzar. Tom. iv. p. 474, 475., we find a mention of the singular alliance, alluded to by Gibbon, between the Tartars and the Franks, for the deliverance of Jerusalem. And tom. ii. p. 202, 203., the Tartars are distinctly stated to have been the *destroyers* of the Turkish kingdom of Roum.

May the author be permitted to add, that he was himself first led to understand Dan. xi. 44. of the crusades, and the Tartar irruptions, by the

will close this number of the Appendix in the words of the same historian, and with a convincing proof of the fulfilment of the *trouble* predicted by the prophecy, in the crusades : “ After the loss of Jerusalem, the Syrian fugitives diffused their *consternation* and *sorrow* : Bagdad mourned in the dust ; the Cadhi Zeineddin of Damascus tore his beard in the caliph’s presence ; and the whole divan shed tears at his melancholy tale.” *

principle, that Providence is the best interpreter of prophecy ? (See Vol. I. p. 171. note *.) On subsequent examination, he found the principle, in both instances, borne out by facts.

* The narrative of Abulfeda is to the same effect : “ Nono mense [Ramadan], Bagdadum veniebant hac de clade *trepidi nuncii*. — Tantopere commovebat ea fama Bagdadenses, ut, continuis quasi convitiis et lacrimis, auxilium flagitarent, et impotes sui, *sacrorumque obliti*, et præ luctu fatiscientes, jejunium Ramaduni diurno alimentorum usu violarent.” An. Muslem. tom. iii. p. 318, 319.

The historian of Saladin describes, with equal pathos, the effect upon the Turks of the great overthrow at Arzof, and the sorrow which then troubled his master’s heart. See Vit. Saladin. cap. cxx.

The charge of the Christian chivalry on that eventful day, as depicted by Bohadin, in the genuine language of an eye-witness, perhaps conveys a more perfect idea of its tremendous power, than any European record of the feudal times. The Latin infantry, overpowered by [the furious onset of the Saracens, and driven among the gardens of the place, was on the point of being cut to pieces, “when,” says the Arabian writer, “ I saw their horse suddenly concentrate, and couch their lances, within the lines of the infantry ; then, with one simultaneous shout, bursting forth on all sides, through the opening ranks of the foot, in the same moment, one mass pierced our right, another our left, and a third our centre, with a fury which made flight and resistance equally vain.” The army of Saladin was destroyed : but the heroic sultan kept the field, until not a man was left to rally at the sound of his brazen kettle-drum. In Mr. Gibbon’s superficial notice of the third crusade, we look in vain for the great battle of Arzof.



157
CSL

FINAL NOTES.



AUTHORITIES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

INTRODUCTION. VOL. I.

NOTE 1. p. 2.] "The whole subject, whether viewed with relation to the extraordinary rise and progress, either of the founder personally, or of the system itself, cannot be otherwise than one of the deepest interest: and we are persuaded, that, of those who have *considered* the comparative influences of the Mahometan and Christian religions, there are few who have not, at times, found themselves confounded at the survey; and compelled to admit, *that even the former must have been ordained for many wise and beneficent purposes*, and to confide in its instrumentality in the production, at any rate, of great eventual good." Retrospective Review, vol. iii. pp. 3, 4. Article, Sale's Koran. Compare p. 68., note (*) of the Introduction. See also President Edwards' Works, vol. viii. pp. 259—265.

Note 2. p. 5.] Roderic of Toledo asserts, that Mahomet was placed, by his uncle Abu Taleb, under the tuition of a Jewish astrologer; and traces to this source his acquaintance, such as it was, with Christianity as well as with Judaism. See Hist. Arab. p. 2., ad calc. Elmacin. Hist. Saracen. Had the Spanish prelate produced authentic vouchers for the assertion, this circumstance would clear up a serious difficulty in the history of Islamism. But the story is of no authority: compare Gibbon, vol. ix. pp. 257, 258. (edit. 8vo. London, 1802), and the testimonies there cited.

Note 3. p. 6.] "*Saraceni nec amici nobis unquam, nec hostes optandi, ultro citroque discursantes, quidquid inveniri poterat momento temporis parvi vastabant. — Omnes pari sorte sunt bellatores... per diversa reptantes in tranquillis, vel turbidis rebus; nec quisquam aliquando stivam apprehendit, vel arborem colit, aut arva subigendo quaritat victum: sed errant semper per spatia longe lateque distenta, sine lare, sine sedibus fixis, aut legibus.*" Ammian. Marcellin. l. xiv. c. 4. This historian pre-