there can be but one at a time. The horns are many:  
they may be as numerous as the emperor shall please.  
 “The seven heads are seven *kings*.”  
 “The ten horns are ten *kings*.”  
 They are both kings in the same sense; they differ  
relatively, as principal and subordinate.  
 The ten kings are distinguished from the seven, as  
being (1) cotemporaneous, (2) subordinate, and (3)  
military. They probably profess no settled territory,  
and do not reside and rule.  
 As the horn of an animal is inferior to the head of  
which it is a powerful appendage, so are these ten  
kings inferior to the seven which preceded them. Hence  
they are set in a class apart.  
 The seven heads are kings of kings. Rome allowed  
some subject kings to retain their diadems in subserviency to itself.  
 These are not kings *of Rome*, as were the seven preceding. And from the expression “they receive  
*authority* as kings,” it would seem that they are not  
actually possessed of territory, and a metropolis at  
which they reside. They are, I imagine, kings of  
*war:* a point illustrated by the history of Napoleon,  
whose generals through war rose to be kings. That  
emperor had in his camp, says Croly, “Five *kings*, four  
princes, twenty-one dukes”: *On the Apocalypse*, p. 116.  
 They are “ten kings.” The Current Interpretation  
has changed this into “ten king*doms*.” This cannot  
be allowed. Moreover it cannot tell which are the ten  
kingdoms. *Sixty* different lists of them have been  
given.  
 (1) The angel’s observation is made in explanation  
of a secret, and is to be taken strictly.  
 (2) The substitution of “kingdoms” produces  
absurdity. “They are ten *kingdoms*, which have