

THE TRANSITIONAL KINGDOMS: VANDALS, HERULI, OSTROGOTHS

After the Roman defeat by the Visigoths at Adrianople in 378, we have the continuing story of the collapse of the Roman Empire as found on page 134 in Lenger.

Stilicho

At the bottom of the first column we discover that the Emperor Honorius (395-423) appointed the Vandal Stilicho as master of the troops. Here was a situation where a barbarian had command of all the military forces! It was not just that the Germans were merely in charge of the wall along the Rhine, but now one of them is in charge of the Roman army inside the wall! It's like the camel's nose under the tent. You see little by little what is happening!

Going to column two: In 406 Gaul was overrun by Vandals and other tribes.

In 407 there was the forced evacuation of Britain, the complete departure of the troops. The dates may vary slightly in some sources but I think this is the standard date for the purposeful evacuation of the island.

And then in August of 408 Stilicho was murdered at Honorius' order! The Emperor did not trust his military commander anymore. Things were just not going right for the Empire.

Rome Sacked!

Notice next that the Emperor Theodosius, emperor in the east who began his reign in 408, "issued the earliest collection of existing laws, the Theodosian Code." When a society has to multiply, classify, and codify more and more laws, you have a good indication that society is breaking down due to increased crime and lawlessness! When people are behaving themselves there is no need for a lot of laws. But when old laws have to be defined and new ones passed as a substitute for the breakdown in people's character, the nation is in trouble. So it was in ancient Rome. So it is in the United States today!!

Now, in 409 Alaric invaded Italy and briefly set up a usurper. Then in 410 this Visigothic leader is able to sack the city of Rome! This had never been done since the Gauls did it in 390 B.C.! (Refer back to page 85.) This is striking. Exactly 800 years later! Rome had gone untouched for 8 centuries!

Look how fast this happened: From the Battle of Adrianople in 378 when the Emperor fell to revolts in France in the army (383) and the evacuation of Britain (407), the making of more and more laws being codified, the attack of the Huns in the east and the Visigoths fleeing from them--so the Visigoths enter into the Empire and dominate much of the West to the point where they are able to go all the way down through the Italian peninsula to the city of Rome!

Alaric soon died in southern Italy and his brother-in-law led the Visigoths into Gaul (412) "and thence began the conquest of Spain from the Vandals (415)."

The Romans Didn't Care!

And so the collapse of Rome continues. This was not a very pretty picture. But it does show that within about one century after Christianity had been legalized, the

Empire was collapsing from within. Many of the pagans blamed the church for the fall; but actually there is every evidence to show that the Empire was on its last legs in the 3rd century A.D. and was saved by a few great men like Diocletian, Constantine, and Theodosius so that the final collapse was postponed for another century.

But it couldn't last, and now it was beginning to collapse because more and more the people had lost all interest in maintaining the Empire. In fact, there were barbarians like Stilicho who were more interested in preserving the Empire than the people in Rome themselves!! They had lost interest. This was the state of affairs!

The Vandals Move In!

Now if we look at the story beginning on page 135 we will see some new developments completely unprecedented in the Roman world! Up to this point—listen!—the whole of the Mediterranean world, for four centuries and more, had been a Roman wash basin! Hereafter, suddenly, something unusual is taking place!

The barbarians were moving past Italy going through France and into Spain—and suddenly you discover that one whole region of the Roman Empire, in the most unlikely area (or maybe the most likely area!), was completely occupied by a barbarian people. We'll use the Roman term here—"barbarian"! This was North Africa occupied by the Vandals who originally came from the regions of Poland. The Vandals had gone from Poland through to north of the Black Sea and the Ukraine, then wandered through central and western Europe through Gaul into Spain, they stayed in Spain until the Visigoths drove them out, and then they went into North Africa.

So now we have the beginning of a very remarkable series of events defined prophetically in the Book of Daniel (Dan. 7:8). Under the date 429—very bottom of col. 2 on p. 134—we read, "The Roman general Bonifatius tried to set himself up as independent in Africa, with the aid of the Vandals, who crossed from Spain under Gaiseric (Genseric). But the Vandals seized Africa for themselves"—not just under the Roman general—"after a two-year siege of" the city of Hippo on the coast not far west of Carthage. During this siege St. Augustine, the bishop of Hippo, died (430).

The next paragraph under the date 430 tells how Aetius, another Roman general, defeated the Visigoths in Gaul. So this man was able to resolve the problem in Gaul but, in the meantime, the Vandals were able to take over in North Africa. And so we date the beginning of the Vandalic kingdom, as a separate independent kingdom in North Africa, in 429. Make careful note of the date 429! Here in the region of central and western North Africa, then, we suddenly discover a German-speaking people, the Vandals, getting complete control. They later (455) got their name because of the way they pillaged—that's the Roman usage of the term—but they were also called "Vandal" earlier meaning somebody who wanders; it comes from the German word vandalen which means "to wander."

Vandal Kingdom RECOGNIZED!

Notice what is stated next in the first column on p. 135 under the year 435: "The Vandal kingdom in Africa was recognized. The Vandals took Carthage in 439." What does it mean they were "recognized"? All kinds of barbarians had been around—the Romans saw them. What is the significance of the term recognized? This is a good modern term.

It means these Vandals were recognized by the Roman government as a legitimate kingdom within the area of Rome itself continuing the Roman government or system— but, in this case, via the Vandals and their government!

All other barbarians up to this time, without exception, were allowed to settle inside Rome's boundaries but were only citizens or, you know, friends; but they did not administer the government. This is the first time a foreign power was allowed to administer the Roman government independently within its own area inside the limits of the Empire!

This was the first of the horns to be established. You remember the ten horns of which 3 were uprooted, which grew out of the beast (Dan. 7:7-8, 20, 24). This was the establishment of that first kingdom.

The Huns Stopped!

Continuing down the page, first column: Marcian was emperor in the east. "He allowed the Ostrogoths (east Goths) to settle as military allies (foederati) in Pannonia"—but the government was not yet administered independently by them. (That is, the Ostrogothic kingdom was not established in Italy until 493 which was the third of the first three horns.)

Meanwhile, in 450, "Attila, leader of the Huns, decided to bring his people from the east into Gaul"—meaning from eastern Europe. Then occurred the famous Battle of Chalons in 451 near the city of Troyes. (And what is the city of Troy doing in the West unless Trojans came there carrying the name!) Langer states here that the Huns were defeated. Actually nobody won this struggle but the Huns went no further simply because they didn't win. The Romans and their allies merely held them; it was a very great slaughter. This battle at Chalons is considered perhaps the most catastrophic slaughter in all ancient warfare in the early centuries of the present era! But it did turn the tide and stop the Hunnic onslaught.

Let me explain that up to this point the Huns had succeeded in occupying all of northern Europe politically (not necessarily by migration), all the way from the unknown reaches of the eastern Ukraine—from Russia into Poland, Germany, the Low Countries, and the rest of eastern Europe north of the Roman Empire—everything south of Scandinavia! Nobody knows yet how this happened, what political means were used to organize this vast territory. But they all gave their allegiance to the Huns as if, let's say, this was a means now of uniting everybody against Rome! There had never been a union like this up to this time. (Note carefully page 157 in Langer.)

On the side of Rome were some of the Ostrogoths and the Franks. This is significant. Many German tribes, as well as some Gothic tribes, sided with the Huns; and a number of others sided with Rome. It was not, in this case, an instance of people warring against each other based on tribes exclusively. Rather, it was a division as to whether the nomadic barbarians of the east, or the civilized decadent Romans of the west, should rule—whether world government would be administered a la Rome or a la Attila! The battle was decided, the Roman Empire stood! This is one reason why ultimately the German Franks and others in the Rhineland that supported Rome became the nucleus for the continuation of the Roman system in the Middle Ages!

The year 450 was when this great Hunnic confederation reached its zenith. But I don't think this has ever been put together properly with the fact that in 449 the Angles and the Saxons left the continent and went to Britain, especially the Saxons. There seems every reason to believe that the Saxons as a people, instead

of wanting to submit to Attila and the Huns, decided—since they were never a part of the Roman Empire, weren't even near it, they were too far north—that they would leave there and go to the British Isles. So what happened was that the ancestors of the English-speaking world left the continent as the Huns were organizing the north of Europe against Rome. That is the picture.

Who Were the Huns?

I cannot take the time here to go into great detail about the background of the Huns. There is material on this in Herodotus. However, it is important to realize that the Huns were the people against whom the Chinese built the Great Wall of China. This was done over 600 years prior to this great battle at Chalons around 214 B.C. (p. 145 in Langer). The Great Wall of China was built to stop the Huns from conquering China! In the West here in 451 A.D. the Romans and their allies didn't have any wall but they prevailed in the battle in France.

The Huns were more than one people. The skeletal structure recovered from the graves of the Huns show that many of them were white. Almost all the leaders around court were German-speaking. This is definitely known. Every evidence shows that the original white Hunnic tribe was German to start with, but went way, way to the east. The common idea is that the Huns were nomadic Mongols who came into Europe out of China. There was intermarriage, but the original Huns were Germans from Europe who went east but much later came back into Europe.

Thus we see that the Germans, whether they are in Asia or in Europe, always feel the need to make war. And so when they were bordering on China, between two centuries B.C. and three centuries A.D., there was this constant struggle. The Chinese finally defeated them—in a sense! That is, the Huns once upon a time defeated the Chinese—and then intermarried with them. And the end result was that a Chinese Hun got rid of all the other Huns! That's the way it worked out; and so they all came back west. First they were in the region east of the Caspian Sea (what is known as Soviet Central Asia today), and then they went west into the Ukraine, and now they poured into western Europe in late Roman times—and then settled in Hungary. Hence we call it Hun-garia, the land of the Huns! However the major people who now live there are not Huns anymore—they are Magyars (see top of col. 2 on p. 261 in Langer). The Huns as a tribe broke down.

Now the ruling family of the Huns, by the way, is preserved in Hungarian tradition—every generation from the beginning down to Attila; and from Attila down to Arpad (see pp. 261-3) who led the Hungarians from the Sea of Azov into Hungary. And the original ancestor of this long line is Nimrod the hunter from the Tower of Babel. This is an interesting thing! They are the only people whose traditions definitely associate the royal line all the way back to Nimrod who intermarried with an Aramaic princely line (I think they were called Alans in the Hungarian tradition). And Nimrod by the Alan woman or women—I forget what the situation was right now, I'll have to reread it—had two sons, Hunor and Magor. Hence the Magyars come from Magor and the Huns come from Hunor. This is their tradition. (But there were other Huns as well, Germanic Huns. And apparently even others like the Naphtalite Huns. We must realize that "hun" in this sense means "ten" in Turkic. Thus some Huns may indeed have even been scattered remnants of the Ten Tribes. Such a thing could be; that is, they were living among them. I don't know anything about the latter except the Naphtalite Huns is a tribe that appears in Greece.)

Vandals Sack Rome

Going on: In 452 Attila invades Italy but is turned back by the Pope—who supposedly warned him but probably paid him! "Attila died in 453 and his hordes broke up." His empire cracked up right after his death. There was no stability in it.

In June of 455 Gaiseric and the Vandals crossed over the Mediterranean from North Africa and sacked Rome. "By the thoroughness of their destruction they attached a permanent stigma to their name." That is, they so thoroughly sacked Rome that anybody that pillages and carts almost everything away is a vandal—to vandalize, to destroy!

The Suevian Ricimer is mentioned in the next paragraph on p. 135 toward the bottom of column one. The Suevi were another people that came into Italy at this time. But all of these other groups, whether Suevi or Visigoths or whoever, did not set up an independent kingdom that continued the Roman government. They ultimately carved out a piece of territory for their own but never, like the Vandals, perpetuated the Roman system! If they were ultimately Romanized it's because Rome took them over. Now we will be coming to two other tribes, the Heruli and Ostrogoths, that continued the Roman government.

Odoacar and the Heruli

Now in 475 we have Romulus Augustus becoming Emperor in the West. Then in September of 476, "after defeating and killing Orestes at Pavia," a group of people from the Baltic, having lived in the region of Czechoslovakia and bordering areas, known as Herulians and Sciri and Rigi and other tribes—groups of Baltic people—under the Herulian Odoacar (or Odoacer) "deposed Romulus Augustulus, the last emperor of the west, at Ravenna." Notice—at the city of Ravenna! Why? Because Rome had been sacked twice already by Alaric the Visigoth (410) and then by Gaiseric the Vandal (455). And the only safe place in Italy was at Ravenna on the Adriatic coast northeast of Rome. That shows what was happening—the entire West was finished! And thus this year of 476 marks the traditional end of the Roman Empire.

Next paragraph: "The eastern emperor, Zeno, apparently recognized Odoacar as 'patrician'—a "title of honor for barbarian commanders." This word RECOGNIZED is again well-used because the Heruli established this kingdom in Italy while the Vandals were in North Africa, and continued the Roman government in Italy as the Vandals continued the government in North Africa but, in this case, in their own style—in their own way. They were independent but authoritatively recognized as perpetuators of the Roman system of government. So, again, the key word you want to take note of is "recognized".

Continuing the paragraph: "Nepos retained titular claim as emperor until his death in 480 and after that date the empire was theoretically reunited under the eastern emperors, but actually Odoacar ruled as an independent king in Italy." Nevertheless, he was recognized officially there. You see, theoretically the empire was reunited but Odoacar was handling it independently in the West. So this clearly shows that in theory the governments were restored—the Roman Empire in the West under Odoacar as a lesser ruler, let's say, and the Eastern Empire predominant. But yet he was really independent as a separate horn.

Theodoric and the Ostrogoths

Now continuing under the date 481: "On the death of Theodoric, the son of Strabo, Zeno recognized his rival Theodoric the Amal—there were two Theodorics who were

rivals for control of the Ostrogoths; see near top of column⁷ as patrician and master of the troops." This part of the story needs clarification. We have the Ostrogoths now, under Theodoric, acting as Zeno's agent; in 488 they invade Italy. So the Heruli held the country for only 12 years.

Continuing the account: "After a three-year siege of Ravenna, Odovacar surrendered in February of 493—which marked the end of the Heruli as a separate power. "After a three-year siege of Ravenna, Odovacar surrendered. He was soon after murdered by Theodoric. Italy was united under Theodoric the Great as the kingdom of the Ostrogoths" now again perpetuating the Empire in the West. So here are our key dates: 429 for the founding of the Vandal kingdom; 476 marked the overthrow of Rome and the founding of the Heruli; 493 witnessed the overthrow of the Heruli and the founding of Theodoric's Ostrogothic realm in the West. These are dates you will want to remember. Mr. Armstrong has used them in the prophecy chart. Take a good look, be familiar with them, and see why the Bible mentions this in prophecy: We are to understand that these three powers were the ones that continued this Roman form of government.

Who Were the Vandals, Heruli, and Ostrogoths?

Now, what are the origins of these three peoples?

The Vandals descend from Vandalus of the royal line of the ancient German kings and would appear to be, in this sense, then, Assyrian at least in the major part of the stock. There may have been others like the Alans who came among them. The Vandalic kingdom was, in that sense, Germanic of Assyria.

The Heruli were Hebrews of the line of Joktan. If you check page 18 of volume two of the Compendium you will discover that Hoeril is one of the ancient German names of Havilah, one of the sons of Joktan (Gen. 10:29). When you see the Hebrew you wouldn't quite grasp it, but Hoeril could be none other than the ancestor of the Heruli. The Heruli were therefore a Hebrew people. The Vandals were Germanic, the Heruli were Hebrew, and the Ostrogoths were the eastern Goths, the children of Gather (Gen. 10:23), the son of Aram and hence Aramaic.

Italy itself, of course, was heavily Chaldean. Hebrew or Chaldean are interchangeable terms. If you want to think of them as descended from Heber as distinct from Arphaxad then they are normally Hebrews and also Chaldean (Gen. 11:12-17). Israelites are, in this sense, descendants of Arphaxad and hence Chaldeans but to look at it this way is a complete misuse of the term: Abraham came from the land of the Chaldees but left all identity behind and is thought of as strictly a Hebrew (Gen. 14:13), and the Chaldees he left behind were just another type of people from which the later Chaldean stock descended.

Now I won't tell the whole story here but in Classical Lit. we may have a chance to read what happened to the Heruli. After they were defeated in Italy some of them stayed within the Roman Empire in the east, but a significant portion went all the way back through Germany, through Denmark, to Thule. Where is "Thule"? That is the question! It is unclear whether they went all the way to Iceland or only to Scandinavia—but they finally ended up in one of those areas. Who knows what they meant by Thule at that time—Ultamathule, meaning the farthestmost Thule. Sometimes they think it means Scandinavia. That may be the case. I have no proof that it would be Iceland—I have no archaeological proof of it. I think it's more likely it was Scandinavia and from there some went on to Iceland. But the bulk of the Heruli originally came from the Baltic (with other Hebrew peoples who were living around them).

Roman Rulers Not Italian!

Now notice the bottom of column two on page 135: Justinian comes to power in 527 and he reigns until 565. So this marks the beginning of the Empire of Justinian who marks the first restoration of the seven revivals of the Roman Empire. The year 527 is when he comes to power in the East—just take note of it. The details of his reign are taken up beginning with page 186 in Langer. What is important about the date 527 is that we will now discover a major revival of the East.

Before going on we should note that many rulers of the later Roman Empire were Thracians, Illyrians, Spaniards—anybody but an Italian! I suppose somebody has made a thorough study of it but I have not seen a list or an outline illustrating this; I suppose we could use Langer and draw up a list of the Roman Emperors showing their background.

Almost all the major rulers of the Roman Empire, beginning with the 3rd century A.D., were non-Italian. All the major leaders were some other people! The Italians had exhausted themselves by the way they had been living. Well actually, look how many lives they must have lost in war to create the empire in the first place—that was the origin of the problem! And finally they were swallowed up by the people whom they ruled over—just more of them!

The best brains in Italy were fleeing elsewhere anyway to find a better place to live. Who wanted to live in Rome with the mob on the dole and viewing all these crazy circuses that were going on! So the most able Romans left and the freed slaves were taking over. Thus Italy was no longer the center. That's why ultimately the center of government was moved to the East and Constantinople became the headquarters of the Empire.

Western Empire "Petered Out"!

Now we'll take a look at the top of column one on page 136: Neither Diocletian nor did any of his successors stop the decay that had attacked the empire. The army became more and more barbarian. "The active defense was entrusted to barbarian mercenaries under their powerful chiefs, who came to dominate the state."

Now notice the next statement containing an expression I like very much! "Thus, the empire in the west did not fall: it petered out!" It just sort of collapsed—little by little by little!

After all, the Vandals were already in North Africa in 429—which is almost half a century (actually 47 years) before Rome fell! And North Africa had already fallen, see? Spain was collapsing, and so on.

Now notice the next statement here on page 136 about the other "leg" of the "image" (Dan. 2): "In the east the empire, in Greek garb, maintained itself, at times as a very great and splendid power, until the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204 and the definitive fall of the city into the hands of the Turks (1453)."

The Goal of the Catholic Church

There was a decline in art. Very little is known of the literature of the day. The one exception was the Church: "Active intellectual life. . . appeared chiefly in the Church." That is, there was now a new idea that the Church, you see, would be able to control the Roman Empire and that this whole wonderful system could be converted, and they were going to create the Roman Empire into the Kingdom of God!

So they had a goal. Their goal--the goal of the Church--was to make the Roman Empire the Kingdom of God. That's we find the Catholic Church being, if you please, conquered by Rome. The saying is that the Church triumphed over pagan Rome--but just the reverse is true! The world has yet to realize this. The Church, then, was completely Romanized.

Continuing with the material on this page: The great religious writers are given here including Eusebius whose great work was Historia ecclesiastica (that's his Church History). Heresy split the eastern Church. Leo I "the Great", the first true pope, and others, "became temporal as well as spiritual leaders of their people." Why? Because by his day--the 5th century--there was no important secular leader in the West! And he really, in a sense, was superior even to the petty representatives of the Eastern Emperor who were residing in Ravenna. He resided in Rome. The bishops of Rome stayed in Rome; the Emperor's representatives from the east were in Ravenna.

"A significant missionary effort of the Church was the sending of Ulfilas to the Goths (c. 340-348), who converted them to Arianism." Since the orthodox Catholic position was not Arianism this effort was not under the authority of the bishop at Rome. The Goths became Arians, the Vandals were Arians, the Heruli were Arians--all these barbarian tribes were (if there weren't pagans among them). Only the Franks, as we have said before, were Athanasian. This is a key reason why the Pope wanted the "three horns" uprooted!

The Donation of Constantine

"A claim of territorial sovereignty began to be based on a fictitious 'Donation of Constantine' to Pope Sylvester /who was the Pope at Rome when Constantine was in power/ of the lands around Rome." This is an important matter. The Pope, Leo I, perpetrated--or hired somebody to perpetrate--a documentary fraud! This was in the period 440-461--you should know those dates reasonably closely.

Here, one century after Constantine, there was claim by the Church to the territory around Rome which had been abandoned by the Western Emperors who had moved to Ravenna. And the Pope claimed on the basis of a document--which was a fraud, a deliberate, intentional fraud--that they wanted to get control of this territory, and they said it had been given to them by the Emperor Constantine! (See page 27 of volume one of the Compendium.)

Now, true Christians can make mistakes. But the church as a whole can never be God's Church when its attempt to get possession of land and territory for tax purposes and whatever else is based on this kind of fraud! This was not a fault in human nature--you know, that they had to overcome. This was deliberate and premeditated! There is no doubt about that, and you should know of it. Today, of course, these topics are hush-hushed in most books although Langer is more likely to record them. It would be interesting for you to read about this matter in Catholic publications and see how the Catholics analyze it in terms of the "white-wash brush"! In reality, the old "mother church" has to justify a lot of things in its past!

Latin

Jerome is mentioned here. He is the man who begins to translate the Bible out of Hebrew into Latin. Latin now became the language of the West because Greek was no longer accessible. The Empire was split! The rift became ever wider. And the West was becoming Latinized and the East Grecianized completely--so that in the end the Empire in the East was Greek--the Byzantine Empire.

More About the Vandals

Now, turning to page 159, we take a closer look at the Vandals—"The Vandal Kingdom in Africa" is given in greater detail here (middle of column one). Notice toward the bottom of the page: "In Africa the Vandals spared nobody and nothing and the first treaty made with the Romans was no restraint. After the arrival of a fleet from Constantinople, a second treaty was made. Eudocia, daughter of Valentinian the Emperor, was betrothed to Gaiseric's son, Huneric, and the Vandals received most of the Roman territory except the region about Carthage."

Notice—a marriage contract linked the two, the Vandals with Rome! Take special note of the marriage because this was the basis of the relationship between the two.

Theodoric and the Ostrogoths

The material on this page continues with the Ostrogoths and their leader, Theodoric the Great (489-526), who succeeded the Heruli in Italy in 493. Very bottom of column two: "Theodoric was the only member of his people who was a Roman citizen; constitutionally the others were alien soldiers in the service of the empire. No Roman was in military command, no Ostrogoth in the civil service."

However, take note of the next statements: "Imperial legislation and coinage continued." In other words, the Roman laws and money continued in use! Note that "Theodoric's 'laws' were nothing more than clarifications of imperial legislation." So here is clear evidence that the Ostrogoths under Theodoric constitute the third horn of Biblical prophecy since they continued and maintained the Roman system!

How the Catholics Exterminated the Heruli!

Most people have never heard the part the Catholic Church played in the story. The Vandals in North Africa were Arian; the Catholics in the region hated them because of this! The Catholics in North Africa (as many books will tell you) openly asked the eastern Emperor to send troops to get rid of these Vandals and he did (pp. 159, 186)—hence the Vandalic Wars under the leadership of General Belisarius. Thus the Catholic Church in the Book of Daniel is looked upon as responsible for this! The little horn that rose up—the Catholic Church—was the institution that asked for this, was the real cause for the troops of the eastern Empire coming to the West to remove the Vandals.

We know that the Catholics also did the same thing with the Ostrogoths in Italy—asked that they be removed. The representative of the Bishop at Rome had gone east to see the Emperor. Hence the reconquest of Italy and the restoration of the Roman Empire under Justinian under the generals, Belisarius and later Narses (pp. 160, 186).

What has never been understood is the part the Catholic Church played with respect to the overthrow of the Heruli. I knew nothing about it for a long time. Students used to ask me, "Well, how do we know that the Catholic Church was instrumental in this part of history?"

The story is found in a recently published book now in paperback, The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians by J. B. Bury (New York 1966), pp. 180-185. The story as found there is this: The Ostrogoths could not defeat the Heruli! So, what happened was that the Catholics in Italy all got together, they and their leaders, and they conspired to work out an agreement with the Heruli—a sort of "live and let live agreement." At this point the Catholics allowed the Heruli to have, you know,

free movement. And on a particular week-end—I think it was a Sunday, when the Heruli were doing their religious observances and so on—all the Catholics in Italy as individuals did what the Arian Ostrogoths could not do! When the Herulians' guard was down, due to the fact that they had made this truce of mutual coexistence, all the Catholics in Italy—every family wherever there was a Heruli in the neighborhood—turned on the Heruli and butchered them! What the army could not do, they let the civilians do! And this is what destroyed the Heruli.

I am sure most historians have never heard this account. But, you know, we would never fall for Catholicism in this country if leaders in the nation, religious and political, were to tell the truth—and if the schools were to tell the truth—about what that church has done! Why it is drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs!

Justinian Restores the Empire

Now on page 160 we have the story of the "Reconquest of Italy by the Emperor" Justinian. In 554 we have the completion of this reconquest; page 161 tells us this: "Justinian's Pragmatic Sanction restored the Italian lands taken by the Ostrogoths and made a pro forma restoration of government. . . ." That is the date given right there in the left margin—554! The SDA's are absolutely wrong when they use 538 because that was only the beginning. It was a major victory, but then the Ostrogoths reconquered most of Italy and not till 554 was the land restored to the Empire—"made a pro forma restoration of government." There it is! The Adventists can't believe it because they don't want to believe it—but the date is right there. It was not until 554 that it was accomplished. It was a 19-year struggle! This is interesting. This is covered in Procopius' Gothic Wars which we take up in Classical Literature class. He shows that the Romans had much of Italy in 538 but they lost their hold and the Goths got control under Totila (p. 186) of most of Italy again. It took until 554 to break the Gothic hold.

After this we have a totally new picture. We have, at this point, the first restoration of the Roman Empire—made from the East at the request of the West (Catholics); and it will represent, in this sense, a kind of restoration around the Mediterranean. This was the last restoration that centers on the Mediterranean. All subsequent restorations of the Roman Empire will now occur in a different geographic situation: centered in France and southern Germany, centered in Germany—or centered in Germany and Austria—and then centered again in France and southern Germany; and finally, under Hitler-Mussolini, in Italy and Germany—which marks the first time Italy is ever fully incorporated as one of the major partners in such a union. But, you see, the center will be shifting now to the heart of Europe north of Italy; Italy is only an adjunct in the Holy Roman Empire until Mussolini revived it. Then it centered again in the Italian peninsula—but the real power in World War II was not Mussolini. That was just the "hot air"! The real power lay north of the Alps—hence the Rome-Berlin Axis (as it inevitably must be).

For all practical purposes, now, we are finished with Rome as an Empire and the whole story will be totally different in Europe. Now begins the story of the modern peoples of Europe. Italy, like ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, becomes secondary (except for the influence of the Papacy).

What Constitutes A Resurrection of the Roman Empire?

In studying the historical fulfillments of the various resurrections of the Roman system, it is important to bear several basic principles in mind. Not every governmental system arising in Italy after 476 A. D. is of necessity a resurrection of the Empire. Nor is collaboration with the pope a deciding factor. A resurrection of the Empire is a combination of various factors, paramount among which must be a desire by the resurging power to imitate the Roman system and to actually look on itself as either a continuation or a revival of Rome. Charlemagne, for example actually minted coins with the inscription "Empire Restored," which leaves no doubt as to what he thought. The same, however, cannot be said for all the national states that emerged after the demise of the original Rome.

The Vandals, on the surface, would appear more as enemies of Rome than as a revival of the system. They even sacked Rome itself (455 A. D.), and never set up a kingdom anywhere in Italy. On top of that, the Vandal kingdom was established in 429 A. D., long before the fall of the Empire (476 A. D.). How then could the Vandals be classed as a revival of ancient Rome?

First of all, the attacks of the Vandals against Rome are not all that important in this discussion. Satan is divided against himself (Matt. 12:26). Should we expect, then, harmony in his system? The Vandals appeared on the scene as enemies of Rome, true. But look what happened. In 429 they crossed over into North Africa and there, in what had previously been one of the wealthiest provinces of the Empire, they established an independent state. This state made a compact with Rome, and--most important of all--it set up its own government on the basis of the Roman system. In that regard it was an independent continuation of the Roman way of life.

Now the question is, if the Vandals were a resurrection of the Roman Empire, then why not also the Visigoths, who set up a kingdom in Spain at about the same time? Here is the difference. The Vandal kingdom was a completely independent state, but set up along Roman lines. The Visigoths, however, were incorporated by the Roman Empire as foederati--confederates. "A Gothic state was created within the Roman state" (Langer, An Encyclopedia of World History, fourth edition, p. 158). The Visigoths administered Southern France and Spain on behalf of the Empire, and by the Emperor's express request. In this regard the Visigoths were a part of the original Empire, not a resurrection of it. The Vandals, however, were independent.

But what about the fact that the Vandal state was established (429 A. D.) long before Rome ever fell (476 A. D.)? Just this: the Vandals,

although established before, continued to survive for many years after Rome itself had fallen. The powers of the Vandals, Heruli and Ostrogoths were all independent states that continued to perpetuate the Roman system after the original Empire itself had collapsed. In this way the Vandals definitely were a resurrection of Rome.

The Lombards never qualified as a resurrection of the Roman system. Even though they invaded Italy, their kingdom never tried to imitate ancient Rome. Nor did they look on themselves as either a revival or a continuation of Rome. They did not have Rome as their capital. They never entered into any kind of a compact with the Empire (Langer, p. 164), --in fact they were just a kingdom, later Catholic, which happened to be established in Italy. But Catholicism is no factor for qualifying as a resurrection of the Empire. If it were, then England would have been a prime candidate, which is unthinkable. The Lombards never were a revival of Rome.

During the Middle Ages there were many kings who entered into compacts with the papacy. For instance, the French Charles of Anjou made an unsuccessful bid for the imperial crown in 1273. But not everyone who makes a deal with the pope qualifies as Holy Roman Emperor. Charles lost the bid, and the imperial crown went to the German Hapburgs, who held it till 1806.

What about Garibaldi and the uniting of Italy? It is true that Garibaldi did not get along with the pope--but neither did many previous leaders of the revivals of Rome, including Napoleon. In Garibaldi's case, the pope plainly stood in the way of a completely reunited Italy. The nation was finally reunited in 1871, with Rome as its capital. However, the one thing that qualified Italy as a revival of Rome was simply the fact that Mussolini proclaimed it as such. In 1936, after the defeat of Ethiopia, King Victor Emmanuel III assumed the title of Emperor and Mussolini proclaimed that this was "the Empire restored."

At the end of World War II, after the fall of Mussolini, however, Italy formally renounced any claims to being an empire. That resurrection of the Roman system is therefore once again dead. All we have at the present is the Republic of Italy, which makes no pretensions about being a resurrected Rome. It remains for another government to arise which will actually claim that it is a rebirth of the Roman Empire.

In conclusion, here is a summary, in greater detail, of the seven resurrections of the Roman Empire:

<u>Restorations</u>	<u>Dates</u>
1. Justinian's Restoration	554-586

2. Carolingians 800-924
Begun by Charlemagne and maintained by his descendants. By 924, however, there was no one left to claim the imperial crown.

3. Ottonians, Salians and Hohenstaufen 962-1250
Begun by Otto I, the Empire continued on through successive German royal houses without interruption. It ended in 1250, inaugurating "the terrible time without an emperor" (1250-1273).

4. Hapsburgs 1273-1806
Their most prominent ruler was Charles V.

5. Napoleon 1804-1814 (1815)

6. Garibaldi to Mussolini 1871-1943
In 1936 King Victor Emmanuel III assumed the title of Emperor of Ethiopia and the Italian state was acclaimed as a restored Empire.

7. Final Revival

These figures give, as near as can be determined, the actual dates of duration for the various revivals of the Roman Empire.

Gunar Freibergs
April 21, 1971