written from that time), **seeing the beast  
that he was and is not and shall come  
again** (see for full explanation, below on  
vv. 9,10). {9} **Here** [**is**] **the mind that hath  
wisdom** (by these words, as in ch. xiii. 18,  
attention is bespoken, and spiritual discernment challenged, for that which fol-  
lows). **The seven heads are seven mountains, where** (so literally) **the woman sitteth upon them** (by these words, no  
less plainly than by ver. 18, Rome is  
pointed out. Propertius, by a remarkable  
coincidence, unites both descriptions in one  
line: “*The city on seven hills, that ruleth  
all the world.*” ‘The Latin poets and prose  
writers are full of similar descriptions.  
See my Greck Test. and references there.  
See also the coin of Vespasian figured in  
Elliott, vol. iv. p. 30): {10} **and they are seven  
Kings** (let us weigh well the significance of  
this indication furnished by the angel.  
The seven hends have a reference to the  
woman, who sits upon the beast to whom  
they belong: and, as far as *this reference*  
is concerned, they are *hills, on which she  
sits*. But they have also another reference  
—to the beast, of which they are the heads:  
and as far as this other reference is concerned, they are *kings*. Not, be it noticed,  
kings over the woman, nor kings of the   
city symbolized by her: but kings in a   
totally different relation, viz. that to the  
beast of which they are heads, So that to  
interpret these kings as *emperors of Rome*,  
or as successive *forms of government over  
Rome*, is to miss the propriety of the symbolism and to introduce utter confusion.  
They belong to the *beast*, which is not  
Rome, nor the Roman Empire, but a general symbol of secular antichristian power.  
They are in substance the same seven  
crowned heads which we saw on the dragon  
in ch. xii, 3: the same which we saw, with  
names of blasphemy on them, on the beast  
of ch. xiii. 1, to whom the dragon gave his  
power and his throne). **The five** (i.e. the  
first five out of the seven) **fell** (in English  
idiom, “are fallen.” Of whom is this word  
used? Is it one likely to be chosen to describe the mere passing away of king after  
king in an empire more or less settled?  
One appropriate to Augustus and Tiberius,  
who died in their beds? Or again is it  
one which could well be predicated of the  
government by consuls, which had been  
absorbed into the imperial power, or of  
that by dictators, which had merely ceased  
to be temporarily adopted, because it had  
become perpetual in the person of one man?  
Had Roman emperors been meant by the  
seven kings, or successive stages of government over Rome [even supposing these  
last made out, which they never have been],  
we should in vain have sought any precedent, or any appropriate meaning, for this  
term, **have fallen**: “have passed away”  
would be its constrained and unexampled  
sense. But let the analogy of Scripture  
and of this book itself guide us, and our  
way will be clear enough. “*Is fallen, is  
fallen*,” is the cry over Babylon herself.  
The verb is used in the Septuagint constantly, of the violent fall, the overthrow,  
either of kings or of kingdoms: it is a  
word belonging to domination overthrown,  
to glory ruined, to empire superseded. If  
I understand these five of individual successive kings, if I understand them of forms  
of government adopted and laid down on  
occasion, I can give no account of this verb   
but if I understand them of forms of empire, one after another heading the anti-christian secular power, one after another  
violently overthrown and done away, I  
have this verb in its right place and appropriate sense. *Egypt* is fallen, the first  
head of the beast that persecuted God’s  
people, Ezek. xxix., xxx.: *Nineveh* is fallen,  
the bloody city, Nahum iii. 1-19: *Babyon* is fallen, the great enemy of Israel,  
Isa. xxi. 9; Jer. l, li, al.: *Persia* is fallen,  
Dan. x.13, xi. 2: *Græcia* is fallen, Dan.  
xi 3,4. Thus, and as it seems to me thus  
only, can we do justice to the expression.  
Nor is any force done thus to the word  
Kings, but on the contrary it is kept to its  
strict prophetic import, and to the analogy  
of that portion of prophecy which is here