passages which assume the return of Nero from  
the East, and his devastations of Rome in conjunction  
with allied kings. Other passages of the like tenor the  
reader may find in *Lib*. viii. p. 688, seq.; and again in  
*Lib*. viii. p. 693, seq.; *Ibid*. p. 715, seq. I have indeed  
quoted but a small part of what is said of Nero. The  
perusal of the whole must be left to the reader, and it  
will overwhelm him with conviction that there was  
spread far and wide abroad for a long time after Nero’s  
death, but specially for the first fifteen or twenty years,  
an anxious fear and even trembling expectation of  
Nero’s reappearance, who would then pervade his  
former dominions like an incarnate demon, and from  
motives of revenge lay them waste with fire and sword.  
 “How widely diffused and deeply rooted in the  
minds of the great community such a fear or expectation respecting Nero was, is manifest enough from its  
permanence among the *churches*, even centuries after the  
death of Nero. Thus in the brief commentary of  
Victorinus Patavionensis (§ 303) he expressly names  
*Nero* as the beast who received the deadly wound, and  
was to be raised up again to be the scourge of the Jews;  
in *Biblioth*. *Max*. iii. p. 420, D.  
 “Down to so late a period as the close of the third  
century, we find clear traces of the opinion still widely  
diffused in the Church, that Nero was yet to return.  
Thus Sulpicius Severus, the ecclesiastical historian of  
that period, *Hist. Sac*. ii. 28: ‘Nero . . . the basest  
of all men and even of monsters, was well worthy  
of being the first persecutor. I know not whether he  
may be the last, since it is the current opinion of many  
that he is yet to come as Antichrist.’ Again in ii. 29:  
‘It is uncertain whether he (Nero) destroyed himself.  
Whence it is believed that although he may have pierced  
himself with a sword, yet he was saved by the cure of  
his wound; in accordance with that which is written.