
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>





600094444V



THE
MYSTICAL WOMAN

AND THE

Cities of the Nations :

OR,

PAPAL ROME AND HER SECULAR SATELLITES.

COMPRISING

FACTS FROM PAST AND COTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY,

WHICH IDENTIFY

THE CHURCH OF ROME AS THE GREAT BABYLON

OF THE

APOCALYPSE;

AND PROVE

*That the long-predicted wasting and destruction of this Harlot Church by
her former Paramours, is near completion.*

BY DIONYSIUS,

Author of "Anomia, or Liberalism and its Napoleonic Messiah," &c.

"Rejoice over her, thou heavens, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged
you on her."—*Rev. xviii. 20.*

LONDON:
WILLIAM MACINTOSH,
24, PATERNOSTER ROW.
1867.



101. e. 137. Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS	v
SECTION FIRST.	
A CHURCH SEEN IN VISION BY THE APOSTLE	1
SECTION SECOND.	
THE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE, A FALSE CHURCH	17
SECTION THIRD.	
LOCALITY OF THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE	33
SECTION FOURTH.	
THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE, A POLITICAL CHURCH	39
SECTION FIFTH.	
THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE, A PERSECUTING CHURCH	54
SECTION SIXTH.	
THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE, A SENSUAL CHURCH	61
SECTION SEVENTH.	
THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE, A CONFIDENT CHURCH.	66
SECTION EIGHTH.	
DOOM OF THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE	71
CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS	135

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS.

THERE are three prominent events—as foretold in the Prophetic Scriptures—to happen just previous to the second advent of the Lord Jesus Christ: 1. The rise of an Antichristian apostacy, having at its head a representative hero, or personal Antichrist. 2. The wasting and destruction of the Roman Harlot, or Mystical Babylon, by that self-same Antichristian power and person. 3. The national recovery or resurrection of God's people Israel by a False Shepherd, or Carnal Messiah. These three leading events, moreover, are not simply contemporaneous, but co-operative, and most intimately blended in that one tremendous transaction by which mankind, in the last phrenzy of Satanic delusion, will seek to usurp the Divine prerogative, and rule the world without any reference to the Supreme and the Eternal. It therefore necessarily follows, that any scheme of prophetic interpretation, having the least pretence to perspicuity, must embrace in one harmonious plan these three subjects; constituting, as they do, a threefold cord of prophetic-historical evidence, in proof (1), that the Bible is God's inspired word of wisdom, conveying His plan of mercy to His creatures, and foretelling for their edification the events of the future; (2) that the times of the restitution of all things predicted in that Word, so long expected and so eagerly desired, are really nearer than many seem disposed to believe; and (3) that all the modern ideas of progress and self-glorification are but the prelude to the world's great and final disaster.

Holy Scripture appears most distinctly to teach us that the destruction of the ecclesiastical woman, "Babylon the Great," will be accomplished by the secular and blaspheming Antichrist—the embodiment, or expression, of the principles of the last

great Apostacy; whilst the assumed Messianic qualities of this same man-exalted personage, are to prove the occasion of Israel's emancipation from political bondage, if not the immediate cause of their final impiety in the land of their fathers, directly subsequent to their return thither.

In the work "ANOMIA" (Lawlessness), published last year, I produced a mass of the most unanswerable evidence in proof that the modern political system termed "Liberalism," is in all respects identical with the predicted last apostacy, or mystery of lawlessness. I also furnished therein much historical testimony of the very strange, yet undisguised, relationship existing between the Napoleons and this apostate system of Liberalism, of which, indeed, they have ever boasted themselves the "champions" and the "incarnation;" thereby, on their own confession, fulfilling in the most convincing manner, the prophecies concerning the person of Antichrist. A small book, entitled "Ruhamah," which I hope to publish next year, will likewise contain some very prominent facts, shewing how this system of Liberalism, or Lawlessness, has, in effect, already given a sort of new liberty to the Jews, and how it is likely to prove instrumental in reviving their national polity in the land of Canaan, under the especial auspices of the Napoleons; who have ever manifested a more than common interest in the children of dispersion. Whilst in the present volume, my allotted task is more particularly to consider the part which this Liberalism and its representative Heroes have taken, in bringing about the desolation of that power termed in Scripture, "Mystery," "Babylon the Great," "the Mother of Harlots," "and abominations of the earth" (Rev. xvii., 5).

A great *many* writers are uttering bold prognostications concerning Louis Napoleon, the Emperor of France. They say he is the seventh revived, or eighth head of the beast—the man of sin—and that his names make the number 666; but very few seem altogether to understand *why* he is the Antichrist, or perceive that he derives his dark mission, and character, solely from his connection with Liberalism or Democracy; that he becomes the *personal* Antichrist only, if he embodies the *principles* of

Antichrist; and that unless "Liberalism," or Democracy, be the last fearful apostacy, Louis Napoleon is certainly not the long predicted "lawless one." Several American writers are busy in a sort of wild and furious abuse of this great Sovereign, but fail to touch the heart and marrow of the subject—the apostacy itself—with all its ungodly and blasphemous aims, out of which the Antichrist is to emerge. They fail to perceive that American institutions offer a fair illustration of that "mystery of lawlessness" as explained by the Apostles; and that nearly all its dark characteristics are well carried out by a large section of the people of the United States. I believe I stand almost, if not quite, alone in the presentiment that Democracy is the last apostacy of man. And startling as such a proposition may at first sight appear, yet by this key I can unlock the threefold mystery of the times of the end; and thereby all incoherency and inconsistency vanishes from my path.

Undoubtedly! Liberalism is a new system of government gradually overspreading the earth. Undoubtedly! it has at its head a representative dynasty—a fact almost unique in the history of mankind. The Papacy attributes its downfall and misfortune to this system. The Jews look to it for emancipation and political redemption. Nothing so complete as to the fulfilment of prophecy has ever before been produced, and no amount of ingenuity could have tortured or twisted events into such harmony with Scripture, had not the one been the real forecast of the other; had not God described our times, true to the facts, so many ages ago.

I feel no small amount of diffidence in dealing with a subject upon which so many, great and good in the Church of Christ, have previously written; and the more so, since I cannot share the views these authors have propounded, but am forced by the stern facts of history, to follow a line of interpretation diametrically opposed to the old, and almost stereotyped, notions of Protestant Ecclesiastics, concerning the Papacy as a prophetic power. I trust, however, that my motive will not be misconstrued; that none will suspect me of any craving after novelty, or vain desire to oppose mere personal thoughts and imaginings,

to the wisdom and researches of others, who, though doubtless mistaken, were both serious and sincere. There is, indeed, nothing more contemptible than a spirit of needless opposition, and nothing so desirable in the Church of Christ, in these days of ambiguity and latitude, as perfect harmony of opinion; and feeling, as I do, the responsibility of any departure from a long received and deeply studied opinion to be great, I hope my readers will, on that very account, be the more disposed to regard with attention those evidences which have so greatly influenced my own mind.

The Papacy has been a favourite theme with prophetic writers for several centuries. Indeed, I think I should not overstep the bounds of strict truth if I were to designate the Papacy as the only subject hitherto deemed deserving of notice, in the estimation of ninety-nine out of every hundred students of the Apocalypse. Resemblances most fanciful—analogs purely imaginative—and interpretations the very reverse of historical, constitute, however, in my humble opinion, by far the largest portion of the prophetic works, both ancient and modern, in reference to the Papacy. Without absolutely entering the arena of controversy, I will just glance, for a moment, at what has always appeared to me to be a gross inconsistency prevailing with many authors in respect to the *imagery* of prophecy. In Holy Scripture, for example, there are a great many emblems or symbols, each possessing, doubtless, its own *specific* and *distinct* application; yet have the ecclesiastical writers on Prophecy, for the most part, involved the entire principle of interpretation, by incongruously applying to the Pope personally—to Popery as a system—or to the Papal Priesthood as a body, emblems as diverse and distinct in their significance as “Beast,” “Horn,” “Head,” “Woman,” “False Prophet,” &c. &c. And by thus bending every prophetic symbol to the one absorbing idea of their minds, they have succeeded in producing a state of confusion, in reference to fulfilling prophecy, which will not easily be controlled. Much, if not all, of the public indifference to prophecy, and the settled conviction on the minds of a large section of the Christian laity that its consideration is unprofitable, is to be attributed,

without doubt, to these mistaken and obscure methods of interpretation.

Take, for example, the most learned work on Prophecy, perhaps, ever compiled, (Elliott's "Horæ Apocalypticæ," 4 vols.),—who can follow intelligently the arguments of that author, or comprehend the confused and contradictory notions he frequently propounds? At times, certainly, the mind of the reader fairly rejoices in the exceeding clearness of the fulfilment of Prophecy which Elliott works out; when suddenly the happy vein of historical evidence is missed, dark entanglement of thought supervenes, and the student is driven fairly away. That amount of solid conviction which the intelligible portions of this great work had been insensibly distilling into his mind, being at once and for ever dissipated by the mystifications that followed.

In attempting to prove too much, the principal writers on the Papacy have thereby brought the entire subject into disrepute; and doubts now exist as to whether the Papacy is, after all, *the* Babylon of the Apocalypse, when there ought to be no question about the identity at all. I shall endeavour, as far as possible in the brief compass of this work, so to clear the subject from past incongruities. as to restore in the minds of my readers a belief in the *reality* of Prophecy; and by setting forth a simple, and purely historical, elucidation of those Scriptural predictions—which, by an all-powerful evidence, pertain exclusively to the false Church seated on the seven hills—I shall hope to convict Papal Rome on all the counts of the great Biblical indictment; and so fasten the fearful facts on many minds, that, like a jury convinced, it may be reluctantly, of the guilt of this Church, they may agree with me in pronouncing that solemn verdict of the angel in the Apocalypse over the Harlot's abominations:—"Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double. How much she hath glorified herself and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her."—Rev. xviii., 6, 7.

Two entire chapters of St. John's Apocalypse are, without doubt, devoted almost exclusively to the false or harlot Church

of the so-called Christian Era, and which all who attentively consider the subject must believe to signify the Papacy. A few verses at the commencement of the xix. chapter (1, 2, 3), part of the 19th verse of the xvi. chapter, and the 8th verse of the xiv. chapter, constitute, apparently, the *sole* biblical notice of this priestly abomination. The other chapters and verses which have been, and still are, applied by certain expositors to the same power, cannot be made, I think, consistently to dovetail with those enumerated above; and when it is recollected that out of 409 verses, of which the entire Revelation of St. John consists, 47 (or rather more than a ninth part) are, upon my method of interpretation, considered applicable to the Roman Catholic Church, I think it may be conceded that this system enjoys no inconsiderable share of attention, having regard to the other mighty agencies for mischief which have desolated, and are still desolating, the Church and the world.

I may say that I expect great resistance to my views from the Clergy—and not unnaturally, perhaps—since I have to ask them to cast aside an accumulation of ecclesiastical literature on the subject of Prophecy—venerable from age, and sacred from association. In soliciting their attention, however, I would repeat that I do not wish to substitute a mere whim or opinion of my own, for the apparently mistaken views of others; but I urge them in all Christian sincerity to compare *facts* with *predictions*, and to behold how marvellously the stirring events of the last half century have illumined the prophetic pages of the Divine Word. I ask them, as the spiritual guides of God's Church below, to read over *again* the written *revelation!*—to study *anew* its emblems, and see whether they cannot now introduce prophetic subjects more generally into their teaching, and so let the Church-militant have the benefit of that portion of truth which was given expressly to console her in the darker hours of watching and trial. I do not ask them to propound any particular author to their congregations; but in all sober and Christian earnestness to study the prophetic Word of God—to learn its grammar—to master its language—and then search the page of history for that fulfilment of its wondrous foretellings, which

must come out at last as clear as the noon day. Many Bishops and Pastors are looking around them for new weapons wherewith to combat Rome's insidious and impudent encroachments; as well as the bold apostacy of Governments and individuals, which threaten such terrible mischief to the fold of the True Shepherd. Well, here they have a powerful defence: God's voice in Prophecy pointing the finger of scorn at this mystical Harlot whom they so much dread; and sounding a trumpet note of warning against that gross and impious apostacy, or mystery of lawlessness, embodied in the most conspicuous individual of our age—"throwing floods of light on many of the political transactions of the last half-century, which have baffled, and still continue to baffle, those who rely simply on the wisdom of this world to guide them."

Although an interval of many centuries separates the Prophecies now under consideration, from their fulfilment; yet both the predictions and their realisation belong to our so-called Christian Era; and consequently the Church is well able to meet the scoffer with arguments capable of almost mathematical demonstration, and to turn off his poisoned shafts of satire with a shield of evidence he dare not, in decency, affect to despise. When St. John foresaw in vision, and foretold in writing, the rise of a false Christian Church, that should sway the hearts and consciences of multitudes of nations, the *human* probabilities of such an event were altogether adverse to its fulfilment. Christianity was then only known to a few disciples scattered here and there about the world. Its proclaimers were under the ban of Imperial prohibition. Paganism was triumphantly asserting its execrable dominion; and the few and despised followers of the cross were, at that very time, suffering from terrible persecution. Then—when the flame of Christian truth was all but extinguished—when it seemed morally impossible that Christianity, under any aspect, could survive the enmity of opposition directed against it—God vouchsafed a series of revelations to his Church, "of things to come to pass hereafter," and mapped out before the wondering gaze of his servant John the future history of the world. He beheld, amongst other emblematical panoramas

a woman, or a Church, false and full of abomination, having her seat at Rome, the great city that then reigned over the kings of the earth. He beheld this Harlot system coquetting with the kings, or rulers, of the surrounding nations, for political objects. He saw her drunken with blood, persecuting the Lord's Saints with relentless malice; whilst her sensuous paraphernalia and splendour excited his wonder and amazement. After a reign of triumph, she was seen to fall; and St. John beheld her stripped, hated, and wasted, by the very powers whom she had decoyed with her spiritual fornications.

Now the Apocalypse of St. John was written A.D. 94 or 95; some even venture to suggest an earlier date, and during the persecutions of the Emperor Nero, A.D. 67 or 68. But that this book of the Revelation was written in the first century—its author claiming for it the sacredness of a divine communication, none can surely dispute. Elliott, in the first chapter of his "Horæ Apocalypticæ," has most ably and exhaustively proved both the date and authenticity of the Apocalypse, and I strongly recommend all who have the opportunity, to read this portion of that author's work; but, for my present purpose, I only care about the date, since that fulfilment of its marvellous predictions which these pages are intended to unfold, must be all-convincing as to its inspiration and divine origin. The contents of this mysterious book we can read for ourselves in the language in which it was originally written, and it most unmistakably foretold a false Christian Church at Rome, several centuries at least before anything like fulfilment, whether in prospect or in fact, was conspicuously manifested. The vision further contains a vast amount of detail in its description of this Church—far too minute to be capable of a wide or general application—but all of which has, nevertheless, received a clear and ample fulfilment; and verily! no greater proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures and of the Divinity of the Lord Jesus can be forthcoming than this miraculous foretelling of an event, centuries before it transpired. Yet our wonder ought not to cease here; for besides the vision of the rise of this Harlot Church, the mysterious angel communicated to St. John a description of

her fall; even specifying the particular instrument God would employ in bringing about her desolation. And what are we now witnessing? (to anticipate for a moment the proofs of identification). Contrary to the opinions of nearly all prophetic writers, who through mistaken views, and erroneous reading, expected to see Rome Ecclesiastical triumph even unto the return of Christ:—contrary to the oft-repeated and confidently-expressed anticipations of the Roman Hierarchy itself:—contrary to the general political ideas prevalent not many years since, of the enduring vitality of that system—Rome Papal *is perishing!* and her cry of despair has been heard, amidst the thunders of revolution, for God had in the first century spoken of her doom. And now, doubtless, we shall soon witness the completion of that process of hating, which—begun under the first French Revolution, and the first Buonaparte—is about to be consummated under the second or revived French Revolution and the second Buonaparte. What possible explanation of all this marvel can be furnished by scoffing men? Is not this God telling man, in times past, things not yet done? and to all who shall read the prophecy of St. John, and neglect so great a proof of God's power and love—verily there can be nothing but that certain fearful looking for of judgment which (as explained by St. Peter) shall devour the adversary.

As I pointed out in the introductory observations to "ANOMIA," Prophecy occupies such an important and prominent position in the word of God, as to be denominated by the angel in the Apocalypse—"the testimony of Jesus." I would fain fasten this mighty truth on the minds of my readers, and likewise invite them to recommend to others so great a specific against those prevailing errors of the day, which presume to question "the testimony of Jesus" as given in the Word. It was the Lord Jesus Himself, who, by the mouth of His angel messenger foretold to St. John the events of the future. "*I—Jesus—have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the Churches*" (Rev. xxii. 16); and the very challenge which our Lord, as it were, throws down to man, in proof of His proper Divinity, is this power to unfold, or unlock the hidden future. None but the "Lion of the tribe of

Judah, the *Root* of David," could prevail to break the seals of that mystic roll which contained the things to come to pass hereafter, and whose contents Christians are privileged to understand solely by virtue of their new relationship to God in Christ. He who is the Word from the beginning (John i. 1) spake by Isaiah saying—

“For I am God, and there is none else;
I am God, and there is none like me,
Declaring the end from the beginning,
And from ancient times things that are not yet done.”

ISAIAH xlv. 9.

In another part of this same Prophecy there is a similar appeal to poor weak humanity, in even stronger language, to prove its power, if it would contend with the Maker of all things.

“Produce your cause, saith the Lord;
Bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob.
Let them bring them forth and show us what shall happen:
Let them shew the former things what they be,
That we may consider them, and know the latter end of them;
Or declare us things for to come.
Shew the things that are to come hereafter—that we may know
that ye are gods.”—ISAIAH xli. 21, 22.

Therefore is it, that Prophecy is the testimony of Christ's Divinity; for as He *did* tell us 1800 years ago, all about the history of these *our* times, He has proved to us thereby His proper Divinity! and shall the Church neglect any longer, therefore, the study of Prophecy? Shall Christians in their controversy with the evils of the day omit the use of such an invincible weapon as Prophecy—which *is* the testimony of Jesus? I think I may affirm that no spiritually-taught disciple of Christ will, on reflection, any longer neglect the studious consideration of the Apocalypse. Not by reading Dr. Cumming, or Elliott, or Newton, or any other writer as a standard of appeal, but that by a prayerful and constant perusal of God's word, he may approve those things that are excellent, and reject those worthless encumbrances of private opinion, and perverted imagination,

which have been such a hindrance to Prophetical truth in times past.

Many writers, alas! seem to have used this solemn and glorious subject as a stepping-stone to notoriety, or as a means of gain! Knowing the weakness of the human mind, and its thirst for startling and sensational information, they have really trafficked upon the word of God, venturing even so far as to specify almost the day and the hour, and presuming to illustrate by *imaginary* pictures the solemn and emblematical visions seen by the apostle, and very fearful is the responsibility they have incurred. It is not necessary for me to point out such writers, because the ordinary common sense of the intelligent reader is sufficient to indicate what is dross, and what is pure metal in Prophetical writings. Another evil, of which *many* of the popular writers on Prophecy are guilty, is excessive plagiarism. They buy up all sorts of works on Prophecy, not to review them! not to expose their weak and commend their sound points! but simply to supply themselves with so much matter which they can hereafter serve up again in a new and generally perverted form. Such conduct in the world, though highly reprehensible, is yet in keeping with the world's crooked ways; but to find *professed* ministers of God guilty of this brain stealing, is lamentable proof of spiritual deadness, and to be regretted—not so much because of the injustice to individual authors, as for the confusion of sentiment and incongruity of expression which it inevitably engenders. It is time some protesting voice was raised against this abuse of a sacred subject. It is time the public were cautioned against patronising, and so encouraging, a class of writers—who, if their direct object and purpose was to bring Prophecy into ridicule and disrespect, could not more effectually succeed. It is time the Church was aroused to shew increased regard for the word of Prophecy, and induced to pray to the Great Spirit of Truth for enlightenment thereon—and, that possessing clear and stable views, she may rescue the subject for ever, from the grasp of those feeble ones, who are for ever prophecying out of their own hearts. I long for the day when the *more sure* word of Prophecy shall give a clear light, and

exercise its legitimate influence on the Church of Christ; when something like the primitive expectancy of Emmanuel's coming to reign, without the primitive impatience, shall manifest itself. The Church ought more than ever in these dark days of evil to be looking for her Lord—the Prince of Life—of Peace—of Righteousness—and not simply in a spiritual and figurative sense, but also literally and intelligently to study the signs of the times in accordance with Christ's command (Matt. xvi. 3), so that beholding the rapid fulfilment of these predictions, she may look for Him her Lord with desire—remembering the ever-gracious promise—that to those who look for Him shall He appear “a second time, without sin, unto salvation.”

“Come, Lord, and tarry not,
 Bring the long looked-for day;
 Oh! why these years of waiting here,
 These ages of delay?
 Come, for the good are few,
 They lift the voice in vain;
 Faith waxes fainter on the earth,
 And love is on the wane.
 Come, for love waxes cold,
 Its steps are faint and slow;
 Faith, now, *is lost in unbelief*,
 Hope's lamp burns dim and low.
 Come, for creation groans,
 Impatient of Thy stay,
 Worn out with these long years of ill,
 These ages of delay.
 Come, and make all things new,
 Build up this ruined earth;
 Restore our faded Paradise,
 Creation's second birth.
 Come, and begin thy reign
 Of everlasting peace;
 Come, take the kingdom to thyself,
 Great King of Righteousness.”

THE MYSTICAL WOMAN.

Section First.

A CHURCH SEEN IN VISION BY THE APOSTLE.

THE PROPHECY.

“And I saw a WOMAN.”—Rev. xvii., 3.

“I will tell thee the mystery of the WOMAN.”—Rev. xvii., 7.

“And the WOMAN which thou sawest is that GREAT CITY.”—Rev. xvii., 18.

“That GREAT CITY, that MIGHTY CITY.”—Rev. xviii., 10.

“What city is like unto this GREAT CITY.”—Rev. xviii., 19.

THE FULFILMENT.

THE emblems of Holy Scripture are as unchangeable as their Author. Selected by Divine wisdom, they are as appropriate as they are constant. They form the alphabet of Prophecy, and whoever is fully conversant with these first principles of interpretation, incurs no danger of being led astray by the fallacious theories which so many prophetic writers impose upon their too credulous readers.

From amongst the fallen race of Adam, a vast multitude of people—of all climes, ages, and tongues—have stepped forward out of the darkness of sinful alienation from God, into the glorious sunshine and freshness of a “new birthright.” Convinced of their own spiritual inanition and utter unworthiness, they have fled for refuge to the offended Author of their being; and God, their Father, ever waiting to be gracious unto them, has received back His returning prodigals with unspeakable rejoicing (Luke xv., 7). The basis of this marvellous reconciliation, as designed and perfected by God, untainted by any human

intervention, is the shedding of blood—without which, we are told, *there can be no remission* of sins; and therefore, these redeemed people are described as those who have made a covenant with the Lord God in sacrifice—even the sacrifice of His well-beloved Son, by whose stripes they are healed—He thus becoming their great Atonement. The covenant so sealed with blood, involves a complete surrender of the weak and sinful creature, to the Infinite and Holy Creator, both body and soul being yielded to the recreative power of Divine love; and, whilst thus submitting, the Supreme Lord has undertaken to re-form in these people His own defaced image—to redeem them from the consequences of the curse, and the power of the grave—and to restore them to a never-ending life of bliss and holiness. He will regain, in fact, for His people the forfeited Paradise.

This vast assembly of the faithful is known to history under the distinctive title of “*the Church.*” Members of *one* family—children of *one* covenant—they have ever been comprehended under that expressive unification, “*the Church.*” Though separated by ages of time, or oceans of distance, the links of the Christian chain have never been absolutely severed; and if in the days of Noah, but one solitary witness for God could be found, his faith was sufficiently strong to endure the tension to which it was subjected, and his exemplary confidence in the mighty power of Jehovah’s arm, successfully bridged over the watery chasm of the deluge. Not even death can destroy the unity of *the Church*; and if men sometimes speak of the Church militant and the Church triumphant, they still constitute but one general assembly and Church of the First-born—still but

“*One* army of the Living God,
At whose command they bow:
Part of the host have crossed the flood,
And *part* are crossing now.”

Known to history as “*the Church,*” the collective body of believers have ever been symbolized, prophetically, under the figures of “*A WOMAN,*” and “*A CITY;*” and when the visible

Church has possessed any sufficient organization, or completeness, she has been invariably styled, The Wife of God—the Mother of Believers. Addressing the Church in Israel, 712 years B. C., the prophet Isaiah predicted, under this emblem of a woman, her blessedness in the latter days:—

“Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear;
 Break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not
 travail with child:
 For more are the children of the desolate
 Than the children of the MARRIED WIFE, saith the Lord.
 Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the
 curtains of thine habitations:
 Spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes;
 For thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left;
 And thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate
 cities to be inhabited.
 Fear not; for thou shalt not be ashamed:
 Neither be thou confounded; for thou shalt not be put to shame;
 For those shall forget the shame of thy youth,
 And shall not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any
 more.*
 For thy Maker is THINE HUSBAND; the Lord of hosts is his name;
 And thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel;
 The God of the whole earth shall he be called.
 For the Lord hath called thee as A WOMAN forsaken and grieved
 in spirit,
 And a WIFE OF YOUTH, when thou wast refused, saith thy God.”
 Isaiah liv., 1—6.

Jeremiah, in his sixth chapter, likens the “daughter of Zion” to a comely and delicate woman; and Hosea, keeping to the same invariable emblem, describes God as speaking to His Church in Israel these words of comfort and hope:—

* The shame of the youth of the Jewish Church probably refers to the servitude in Egypt; and the reproach of her widowhood, to the Babylonish, Assyrian, and Roman Captivities and dispersion.

“And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord,
That thou shalt call me Ishi (my husband),
And shalt call me no more Baali (my Lord).
And I will betroth thee unto me for ever;
Yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in
judgment,
And in lovingkindness, and in mercies.”—Hosea ii., 16—19.

Departing from her faithful allegiance to the truth, corrupting the Word of God by traditions, and “teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,” the Jewish Church was still known under the figure of a WOMAN, though no longer recognised as a true wife. Therefore Isaiah is made to cry:—

“Where is the bill of your MOTHER’s divorcement, whom I have put away?”—Isaiah l., 1.

Whilst Hosea’s appeal to the people of Israel is:—

“Plead with your MOTHER, plead :
For she is not my WIFE ; neither am I HER HUSBAND :
And I will not have mercy upon her children ;
For their MOTHER hath played the HARLOT.”

Hosea ii., 2, 4, 5.

The prophet Jeremiah accuses Israel in the same strain, employing the identical figure:—

“Surely as a WIFE treacherously departeth from her husband,
So have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith
the Lord.”—Jeremiah iii., 20.

Ezekiel devotes the whole of his xvi. chapter to a description of Israel’s departure from God—as of a WIFE forsaking her HUSBAND ; and, summing up the category of evils which are laid to her charge, exclaims:—

“How weak is thine heart, saith the Lord God,
Seeing thou doest all these things—the work of an IMPERIOUS
WHORISH WOMAN !”—Ezekiel xvi., 30.

And in a great multitude of passages, the Jewish Church is styled a HARLOT, because of her corruptions:—

“How is the faithful city become an HARLOT!”—Isaiah i., 21.

“Thou hast played the HARLOT with many lovers.”—Jer. iii., 1.

“Israel committed adultery, I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the HARLOT also.”—Jeremiah iii., 8.

“But thou didst trust in thine own beauty,
And playedst the HARLOT because of thy renown.”

Ezekiel xvi., 15.

The xxiii. chapter of Ezekiel, likewise, is all about the same evil of idolatry, under a similar metaphor.

Leaving the Old Testament, I find the Church of the Living God still compared to A WOMAN—A WIFE—A BRIDE. The Lord Jesus Himself, on two occasions, signified His approval of this emblem: “Can the children of the bridechamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?” (Matt. ix., 15) enquired He of the disciples of John. And when told, on one occasion, that His mother and His brethren sought Him, He answered His informant in words of deep prophetic significance: “Who is my MOTHER? and who are my *brethren*?” “And He stretched forth His hands towards His disciples, and said, Behold my mother, and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother” (Matt. xii., 48—50). God’s believing people, constituting the Church, are *collectively* the Mother of Christ, as one of human kind; who is also the “elder brother” of each individual saint. As God-man, the Lord Jesus is the HUSBAND and BRIDEGROOM of His Church—a truth taught us so beautifully in the Revelation of St. John:—

“The marriage of the Lamb is come, and His WIFE hath made herself ready.”—Rev. xix., 7.

“Come hither, I will shew thee THE BRIDE, the LAMB’S WIFE.”
—Rev. xxi., 9.

And the Church is likewise described as the MOTHER OF BELIEVERS, and as a WOMAN, also in the New Testament:—

“Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the MOTHER of us all.”—Galatians iv., 26.

“And there appeared a great wonder in heaven: a WOMAN clothed with the sun.”—Rev. xii., 1.

Having sufficiently demonstrated the value of my assertion that “A WOMAN” is the true scriptural emblem of a Church, I can pass on to notice the appropriateness of that emblem. The duty of the true Church is to beget children for the Lord. It is by the action of God’s grace on her members individually, and on her teaching and discipline collectively, that souls are begotten to a lively hope through the Gospel of Jesus. Suffering precedes the natural process of child-bearing, and joy follows after. So, in the spiritual world, there is invariably sorrow and anguish where any true work of God is going forward; and afterwards, rejoicing over the souls who have passed through the pains of the new birth. Each faithful ministry of the Word is a continual travail. Christ, the Head of His Church, is represented in the Prophecy of Isaiah as *travailing*:—

“When thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin,
He shall see *His seed*, He shall prolong His days,
He shall see of *the travail of His soul*, and shall be satisfied.”

Isaiah liii., 10, 11.

St. Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, describes his anxious, painful suffering, about the welfare of his converts, as a *travailing*:—

“My little children, of whom *I travail in birth* again.”—Galatians iv., 19.

He also speaks of Onesimus, as one whom he had “begotten in his bonds.”—Philemon, 10.

Isaiah’s cry at the prospect of Emmanuel’s birth was:—

“Unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given.”

Isaiah ix., 6.

And St. John, in the Apocalyptic vision, sees the same glad event, under this precise figure:—

“A woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: and she being with child cried, *travailing in birth*, and pained to be delivered.” “And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron; and her child was caught up unto God and to His throne.”—Rev. xii., 1, 2, 5.

It was when the Jewish Church *travailed* that converts were given to her; for—

“As soon as Zion *travailed*, she brought forth children.”

Isaiah lxvi., 8.

And it is to the faithful praying and *travailing* dispensers of the good seed, that God is now pleased to vouchsafe an abundant harvest. That mighty change wrought upon the souls of men in conversion, is allegorised as the “new birth,” the “being born again.” Everything is new and strange to the babe in Christ; and, unable to walk alone, the Church, still following up her duty, nourishes such with “the sincere milk of the Word (1 Peter ii., 2), that they may grow thereby.” Young converts, no matter what their natural age, are yet babes in Christ. Our Saviour, in His wonderful prayer, thanked the Father for having hid these things from the wise and prudent, and for revealing them unto babes (Matt. xi., 25, and Luke x., 21). St. Paul’s address to the young Corinthian Church is based on the same spiritual analogy: “And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto *babes* in Christ. I have fed you with *milk*, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able.” (1 Cor. iii., 1). The unskilful in the word of righteousness are likened to infants by the Apostle, in Hebrews v. 12, 13, and are said to have need of milk, not of strong meat. This milk of the word is just the most elementary and simple teaching of the Gospel of Christ; and as the *babe* expands into childhood and manhood, so the Church has suitable food for its support and edification.

The childhood of the Christian is the second stage in his spiritual career; and the Lord Jesus has Himself endeared this condition to us by those ever gracious words: “Suffer little

children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of heaven." The most renowned philosopher, or the most demonstrating mathematician, must both alike receive the kingdom of God as little children, if they would gain admission to its holy privileges. The apostles St. Paul and St. John addressed their young converts as "little children." Repeatedly are the saints called "the children of God;" and St. John breaks out into a glorious rapture, when contemplating the adoption of man into the family of God: "Behold," he says, "what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the *sons* of God!" And then there is the gracious care over the tender spirits of these children, implied in the warning that "it were better a millstone were put around a man's neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend one of these 'little ones.'"

Addressing His people in the words of the Psalmist, God says: "Come, ye *children*, hearken unto me" (Psalm xxxiv., 11). In Proverbs He appeals to man in a similar strain: "Hear, ye *children*, the instruction of a Father." In Isaiah there is the bitter lament over man's ingratitude: "I have nourished and brought up *children*, and they have rebelled against me" (Isaiah i., 2). The Lord Jesus commended to us certain duties that we might be the *children* of our Heavenly Father (Matt. v., 45). St. John rejoices to hear that his *children* walk in the truth (3 John 4). And in innumerable passages are the saints termed the *children* of Light; the *children* of God; the children of the Resurrection.

How sweet the figure! and yet how responsible the position of the Church militant, in having these tender souls committed to her nursing care! How ought she to nourish them with a pure and perfect teaching, and keep them well instructed in the way and will of God their Father!

After childhood comes another, and more advanced, stage of Christian growth and experience, described by St. Paul as being "henceforth *no more children* tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine" (Eph. iv., 14). Thus we find there are young men in Christ. It is that matured condition when the

heart is established firm in the faith, and is to be nourished by the Church with strong meat. The natural mother's solicitude for the welfare and happiness of her child ceases not with his coming of age. She follows him with her loving counsels, and invokes untold blessings on him in her prayers. So in the family of God: the Mother Church never ceases her maternal anxieties over her sons and daughters, but follows them with affectionate importunities, even until the race of life is finished. Therefore, we find both Prophets and Apostles counselling *young men*:—"I write unto you, *young men*" (1 John ii., 13). "*Young men* likewise exhort to be sober" (Titus ii., 6). "Wherewithal shall a *young man* cleanse his way?" (Psalm cxix., 9). Yea, we find even the close of life unforgotten in the Church's care; for St. John addresses the old men: "I write unto you, *Fathers*" (1 John ii., 13).

Not more constantly is the emblem of "A WOMAN" employed to describe the Church of the Living God, than is that of "A CITY." Indeed, before the death of Christ, His Church was so intimately associated with a literal City, as to have derived one of its most endearing names from that central spot where it pleased the Father signally to display His glory and presence. And when we speak of the "City of Zion," what Christian man but recognizes, under this allegory, the assembly of God's faithful people, *the Church*? The old saints were always talking and singing about *Zion*:—

"Send thee help from the *sanctuary*, and strengthen thee out of *Zion*."—Psalm xx., 2.

"Walk about *Zion*, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof; mark ye well her bulwarks."—Psalm xlvi., 12, 13.

"Out of *Zion*, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined."—Psalm l., 2.

"They go from strength to strength; every one of them in *Zion* appeareth before God."—Psalm lxxxiv., 7.

"The Lord loveth the gates of *Zion*. Glorious things are spoken of thee, O *City of God*."—Psalm lxxxvii., 2, 3.

“When the Lord shall build up *Zion*, He shall appear in His glory.”—Psalm cii., 16.

“For the Lord hath chosen *Zion*; He hath desired it for His habitation. This is my rest for ever.”—Psalm cxxxii., 13, 14.

“Out of *Zion* shall go forth the law.”—Isaiah ii., 3.

“Behold I lay in *Zion* for a foundation stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation.”—Isaiah xxviii., 16.

“Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in *the City* of our God, in the mountain of his holiness.”—Psalm xlvi., 1.

Texts such as these hardly have any fair literal application, or at least the literal is entirely subordinate to the figurative and spiritual. A City, any more than a Church, cannot be composed exclusively of stone walls and material temples. It is the people who constitute the City, as well as the Church; and the reality of a City, as of a Church, consists of the hearts of the people. Stone walls and temples are dear only as objects of glorious association, or silent memorials of the life that once reigned within. And this allegory of the Church was confirmed by our Lord Himself (Matt. v., 34, 35), where, condemning the practice of inconsiderate oaths, He says: “Swear not at all: neither by Jerusalem, for it is *the City* of the great King.” In the lxxii. Psalm, David gives a glowing description of the reign of Christ, and portrays the members of the Church as the children of the city: “And they of the city shall flourish like grass of the earth,”—equivalent to “The righteous shall flourish like a palm tree.” Isaiah, in predicting the purity of the people of God in the latter days, does so under the emblem of “a City:”—

“Afterwards thou shalt be called the *city of righteousness*, the *faithful city*.”—Isaiah i. 26.

Again this same prophet prays, and foresees, connecting the city plainly with the tabernacle, which was the outward expression of the Church, the type or pattern of heavenly things:—

“Look upon *Zion*, *the city* of our solemnities;
Thine eyes shall see *Jerusalem* a quiet habitation,

A tabernacle that shall not be taken down :
 Not one of the stakes shall ever be removed,
 Neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken."

Isaiah xxxiv., 20.

In another place, he foreshadows the great gathering of the people of the Lord at *Zion* :—

"The redeemed shall come *unto Zion* with singing."

And not only the redeemed, but He who is both the foundation stone, and top corner (angular) stone of the Church, the city of God, also; for—

"The Redeemer shall come *unto Zion*."

Zechariah foretells that—

"Jerusalem shall be called *a city of truth*;

And the mountain of the Lord of hosts the holy mountain."

Zechariah viii., 3.

Ezekiel, in his magniloquent and figurative description of the Church of God in her days of coming triumph, occupies no less than eight entire chapters—employing the imagery of a magnificent and splendid city, and concludes with these beautiful words: "And the name of *the City* from that day shall be, 'The Lord is there.'"

Doubtless many of the Jewish people—perhaps even the nation at large—failed to perceive the true significance of all this appropriate imagery. Familiar in some sense as the symbols must have been to them, yet lost in the carnal mazes of an earthly career, they seem not to have imbibed the soul and life of their religion, thus powerfully presented to their minds; but practically rejected it, as they did, a little later, the Divine Author of it Himself. Dark, however, as the nation of Israel at large was, concerning the Church of God, it is impossible not to observe how really spiritual some of the old saints were in their conceptions regarding this "City of the Great King;" thereby proving that it was not simply the literal city, its stones, and buildings, that inspired their prayers and affections (dear as they doubtless were to them, in a certain sense), but that they

had learned to associate with the name and locality of Zion—even as the Church still does—glory, honour, and immortality in the presence of the Lord Jesus, who is *Zion's King*—the *King of Glory!*

But if any doubt that the old Prophets were really intending to teach the people concerning the Church, under the figure of “*a city*,” as the Zion, even Jerusalem; I think complete assurance is obtained by the clear testimony of the Saviour and His apostles. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, is abundantly plain on this matter. Abraham's anticipations of the future rest, he describes as the looking for a city:—

“He looked for *a city* which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.”—Hebrews xi., 9.

As to the old Patriarchal Saints, St. Paul affirms their inheritance under the figure of a city:—

“Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for He hath prepared for them a city.”—Hebrews xi., 16.

The lot of the child of God in this world he expresses as a changing *city*:—

“Here have we no continuing *city*, but we seek one to come.”—Hebrews xiii., 14.

His Hebrew converts, who by faith had realised their great future, he describes as having come to the “*city of habitation*.” And again:—

“But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto *the city* of the Living God, the *heavenly Jerusalem*, the *Church* of the firstborn, which are written in heaven.”—Hebrews xii., 22, 23.

How superb and enrapturing, likewise, are the views of the future state of the Church, under this emblem of a City, as given by the Lord Jesus in the visions of the Revelation! There “the Bride,” “the Woman,” “the Lamb's Wife,” is expressly identified as “the Holy City.” “New Jerusalem,” coming down from God out of heaven (Rev. xxi., 2); “that *great city*,” the holy Jerusalem (Rev. xxi., 10); together with a vast amount of

urban imagery well worthy of the most prayerful consideration; and from which we learn that the "City of God," as described by the prophet Ezekiel, is identical with this city in the Revelation: the Lord's presence being vouchsafed in both cases, as the consummation of its bliss (Rev. xvi., 22, 23). Those who overcome are to have written on them, "the name of the city of my God, which is New Jerusalem," (Rev. iii., 12)—that is, they are to be enrolled as citizens of the kingdom; or as St. Paul puts it, they are made "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." And, following still the figure, he thus continues to describe their blessedness: "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets; Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone" (Ephesians ii., 19, 20). Again, in another place, we read, "blessed are they who do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into *the city*" (Rev. xxii., 14, 15). It is the *Jerusalem* which is above, that is free, and is the *Mother* of us all; (Galatians iv., 26)—a beautiful expression this of the Universal Church, embodying both the emblems of a City and a Woman: all God's people gathered into one fold, and enclosed within the encircling walls of the heavenly Zion; whilst "*without the city*," and outside the Church, is trodden "the winepress of the wrath of God." (Rev. xiv., 20).

Since the Canon of Scripture was completed, and for the past eighteen centuries, the Church has never ceased to recognise this emblem of her unity. How the heart of the Christian worshipper swells with exultant expectation, when singing those hymns in which is employed the imagery of a city!—all in further evidence of the truth of my proposition that "a City" is a true emblem of a Church:—

"Jerusalem the golden!"

"O when, thou city of my God."

"Jerusalem, my happy home!"

"We've no abiding city here."

"O bright those halls of Zion!"

"O Zion, tune thy voice!"

These few first lines will serve to remind the reader of the sweetness of those songs, for ever associated with the glory of the heavenly city.

The true Church known under the figure of "a city," the false Church is likewise depicted by the same emblem—"a city;"—only, just as with the other metaphor, "a wife," by forsaking her privileges becomes a harlot, so the City of God is replaced by the City of the seven hills; and the heavenly Jerusalem has for its antithesis the Mystical Babylon. The great cities, both of ancient and modern times, do but represent the unceasing efforts of Satan to bring about a mock unity, in imitation of the unity of the Church. The chief adversary has ever been putting forward great cities as centres of that universal government which he has been labouring so assiduously to set up: The one an imitation of Christ's Kingdom, and the other an imitation of His Church, which is to rule that kingdom.

Coming to the consideration of the appropriateness of this second emblem of the Church of God—"a City,"—I find there is implied in it, just those moral excellencies and conditions which Christianity was intended to impart to an unbelieving world; and which will yet ultimately predominate everywhere—when that mystical City shall descend from God out of heaven, to take charge of the government of mankind. A city is an aggregation of individuals, who live together by the concurrent acceptance of certain fixed laws, in the observance of which they are good citizens, but who through any violation of their compact are deprived of the privileges of citizenship. So the Church of God is an assembly of faithful people, who have surrendered themselves voluntarily to the obedience of Christ's laws, as revealed in the Bible; by preserving which, with Christian consistency, they are fellow citizens with the saints; but by any departure therefrom become aliens and strangers from the commonwealth of Israel.

A City, according to its more modern and strict signification, has over it a presiding Bishop, or Shepherd. So the Church of God is described as "one fold, with one Shepherd" (John x., 16); and St. Peter likens the return of a man to his God and the Church, as a returning unto the Shepherd and Bishop of his soul.

A City hath *foundations*, deeply and firmly laid, so as to endure for ages. So the Church is a spiritual city, which hath foundations,

even twelve foundation stones, and one chief foundation Stone; and so firmly is this foundation planted in the eternal purpose of God the Father, that it will never be moved. It is a tried foundation (Isaiah xxviii., 16), it standeth sure (2 Tim. ii., 19), even the foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone (Eph. ii., 20).

A City (especially in Eastern countries) hath walls and bulwarks, for a defence and protection to its inhabitants; behind which they repose in safety. So the Church of Christ is sheltered by "a wall great and high" (Rev. xxi., 12); which wall is like jasper, so strong is it (Rev. xxi., 18), having twelve foundations; and as to their defensive power, so certain is it, that they are to be called Salvation (Isaiah lx., 18); yea, "Salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks" (Isaiah xxvi., 1); foreseeing which, David, in the ecstasy of realization cries: "Mark ye well her bulwarks" (Psalm xlviii., 13).

A City hath strong towers, or citadels, places of strength for refuge in times of emergency, whither the garrison may retire when hard pressed by an enemy, and to which the inhabitants also rush when danger is most imminent. So the Church has its strong towers: as witness David's confession—"Go round about Zion, and tell her towers" (Psalm xlviii., 12); and it has specially its chief tower, or citadel, that never fails in its impregnability; for "The name of the Lord is a strong tower: the righteous runneth into it, and is safe" (Prov. xviii., 10); whilst David further describes the Lord as "a strong tower from the enemy" (Psalm lxi., 3); also as his "high tower" (2 Sam. xxii., 3).

A City hath habitations, or residences for its inhabitants. So the Church is said to be a city of habitations; and God's people, in their day of coming glory, are to dwell in peaceable habitations (Isaiah xxxii., 18).

A City hath its temple, or centre of worship, to which the inhabitants of the city and country gather themselves for prayer and praises. So the Church has its temple—a living temple—"For the Lord God Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple of it" (Rev. xxi., 22), and the saints are pillars thereof (Rev. iii., 12).

A City hath gates; and every man entering the City, except through the gates, is counted for a thief or a robber. So the Church is entered by gates, even twelve gates; for the City hath twelve gates, and in them the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. They are moreover described as twelve pearls—so goodly and precious are they. The Church, besides, has one special gate or door of entrance, even the Lord of Glory; and no man can come unto the Father, but by Him.

A City dispenses privileges to its citizens: they become by election free-men. So the Church has its free-men; for "he that is called is the Lord's freeman" (1 Cor. vii., 22); and he stands fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made him free.

A City hath watchmen constantly on the alert, to discern any approaching danger. So the Church of Christ hath its spiritual watchmen, who watch unto prayer.

A City hath its ambassadors, or messengers. So the Church likewise has its ambassadors: "Now, then," said St. Paul, "we are ambassadors for Christ."

A City hath its great feasts, or banquets, to which not only its own citizens, but foreigners and strangers likewise are invited. So the Church has its great feast, to which *all* men are invited. It is that great marriage supper of the Lamb, where the saints of God will sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of Heaven. It is that glorious feast at which Christ shall first, after His ascension, drink new wine with His people, in His Father's Kingdom.

The Church of Christ, as I have endeavoured to explain, is presented to the mind under the appropriate emblems of "a Woman," "a Bride," "a Wife," "a Mother;" whilst the false Church is equally represented under the figures of—"a Woman," "a Harlot," "a Whore." The true Church is further distinguished under the metaphor of "a City;" the false Church being equally symbolised by "a City,"—even by "Babylon," the great founder of all heresies; and, these points thus made clear, I shall have no difficulty in treating the Papacy as the subject of prophetic warning and denunciation, under the titles of "Babylon the Great," "the Mother of Harlots."

Section Second.

THE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE—A FALSE CHURCH.

THE PROPHECY.

“The GREAT WHORE.”—Rev xvii., 1.

“And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, the MOTHER OF HARLOTS and abominations of the earth.”—Rev. xvii., 5.

“The GREAT WHORE, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication.”—Rev. xix., 2.

“Having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.”—Rev. xvii., 4.

“For by thy sorceries were all nations deceived.”—Rev. xviii., 23.

“Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.”—Rev. xviii., 4.

THE FULFILMENT.

I BELIEVE that in the *preceding* Section, by an abundance of Scriptural proof, I have sufficiently established the proposition, that it was a *Church*, and a Church only (not an Empire or Kingdom), which the veteran Apostle was permitted to behold in vision, under the emblems, or figures, of “a City,” and “a Woman.” My second point, therefore, and next step in advance, is to prove that the Church thus seen was a false Church; for, as the reader will observe on looking over the prophetic description at the head of this Section, the emblems of a faithless system of religion are abundantly employed, and are not applicable to anything else than an ecclesiastical institution, which has broken away from her allegiance to the holy and the true.

Base coin is a spurious *imitation* of that which is genuine;

and, though lacking the preciousness of the currency of which it is a counterfeit, possesses, nevertheless, a certain measure of truth. The "image and superscription"—the form and external appearance—are in both cases identical; and it not unfrequently requires a skilful eye, and well practised ear, to detect the false ring and defective colour of the fraudulent combination. So with respect to a false Church: there must be some amount of truth mixed up with its deceitful doctrines—some basis of pure Gospel to carry the huge and lying superstructure—some glitter, and show of genuineness, to hide the monstrous imposition within. If this were not the case, the system would rather be a *rival* Church than a *harlot* Church; would not be likely to deceive the elect of God; and the figures employed, moreover, would in other respects be altogether inapplicable.

The Church of Rome—which, according to the evidence of many indisputable facts, I am prepared to identify with the false Church seen by St. John in Patmos—was once pure, and a true wife; the Church at Rome, whose "faith was spoken of throughout the whole world" (Romans i., 8). Seduced by lust of power, and corrupted by contamination with surrounding heathenism, she treacherously departed from her allegiance to the simple principles of Christianity, perverted the truths she taught by adding doctrines and dogmas of human invention—thus making void the Word of God by tradition—and gradually worked out in her dark system of theology, all those abominable theories which have gained for her such an unenviable notoriety.

I do not propose to discuss the general teaching of the Roman Church in this work, for that subject has been exhausted, long ago, by more able defenders of the faith once committed to the saints; and, as my readers are for the most part likely to be Protestants, I cannot imagine any dissent from the proposition that the Roman Church teaches a false and pernicious faith to her children. But, beyond the broad fact that a spurious religion, having the semblance of Christian truth, would arise in the world, the details of the prophecy afford us such a deep insight into some of the more prominent principles and practices

of this Church, as make any danger of misapplication, or misapprehension, almost impossible.

Some writers accuse the Church of Rome of making an unholy compromise with Paganism; and there is, alas! very clear historical evidence that Roman Catholicism is an admixture of mythology and theology, a blending of the good principles of Christianity, in small measure, with the sensual and corrupting adjuncts of idolatry in great abundance. The historian, Gibbon, very plainly tells us of all this, in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." After describing the introduction of Saint-worship into the Papal Church, that Author thus sums up his evidence against Rome Ecclesiastical:—"The sublime and simple theology of the primitive Christians was gradually corrupted; and the Monarchy of heaven, already clouded by metaphysical subtleties, was degraded by the introduction of a popular mythology, which tended to restore the reign of Polytheism." "As the objects of religion were gradually reduced to the standard of the imagination, the rites and ceremonies were introduced that seemed most powerfully to affect the senses of the vulgar. If, in the beginning of the fifth century, Tertullian or Lactantius had been suddenly raised from the dead, to assist at the festival of some popular Saint or martyr, they would have gazed with astonishment and indignation on the profane spectacle which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation." "The same uniform original spirit of superstition might suggest, in the most distant ages and countries, the same methods of deceiving the credulity and of affecting the senses of mankind; but it must ingenuously be confessed that the Ministers of the Catholic Church imitated the profane model which they were impatient to destroy."

GIBBON, Chap. xxix.

Like the Jewish Church of old, this Church of Rome, whilst professing still the doctrines of Christianity, introduced into her service the idols and practices of the Pagan people of the land, thereby securing for herself the title of spiritual Harlot, and held up by God to scorn. Yet the Roman Church is not only a Harlot Church in God's sight, but, in some mysterious manner,

she is the "*Mother of Harlots*;" that is, presuming the identification to be sound, and there will be found something peculiar in her false system, which connects it with the first recorded rebellion against God after the flood, and stamps upon her bold and defiant forehead the names "Mystery, Babylon the Great."

Now the full force and meaning of these remarkable designations of the Roman Church have only quite recently been established, and in a manner which still further proves that incontestible principle of interpreting all Prophecy by simple history, for which I so earnestly contend;—without admitting, for one moment, any notion or opinion that is not in itself sufficiently obvious to the most unsophisticated mind.

Fifty years ago, it would perhaps have been very difficult to explain to an unlettered audience, the reason why the Apostle John called the Roman Church "Babylon the Great" and the "Mother of Harlots;" but now, with recent discoveries at our service—by means of statues and inscriptions actually existing—it will be easy to instruct anyone, even a child, in the meaning and applicability of these names to the Papal Whore. Greek, Roman, and Egyptian Mythology, though the favourite study of youth for centuries, has, until within the last twenty years, remained a sealed and unexplained mystery. We read in our earliest school-days of gods and goddesses possessed of all manner of attractions, but could never discover their true origin or history, so completely shrouded was the subject in impenetrable darkness. Names without any apparent signification; attributes too numerous to mention, only served to increase the perplexities; whilst here and there strong resemblances to Divine truth, or suggestions of Divine power, led many to suspect that, in some way, mythology was but a perverted and corrupted theology. The darkness which once enveloped the subject has, however, suddenly disappeared. By the removal of a little superincumbent earth, that sealed up the records of an age preceding the Grecian and the Roman, a full and satisfactory explanation of the enigma has been found, and the clouds and mists, in which the gods so loved to dwell, have been dispersed for ever, their

human and wicked origin exposed, their perversion of holy truth discovered, and the Book of God still further vindicated in the sight of all men.

The statues, and inscriptions, discovered on the sites of ancient Nineveh and Babylon, have, however, done still more for the Church and the world than simply exposing the idolatries of heathen lands, and the abominations of heathen mythology. The excavators of those renowned ruins have been God's unwitting instruments for unveiling the dark and treacherous design of the Harlot Church of Rome. The disguise of the Papal Woman, and the mask that shrouded her hideous deformity, have been stripped off by the explorers of ancient Babylon; and we, in this nineteenth century are able, by the substantial evidence of stone writings, and sculptures, executed hundreds of years before Christ's birth, to point the finger of scorn at the Woman seated on the seven hills of Rome, and to say, in the words of St. John, Behold "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and of the abominations of the earth." Papal Rome is found to be a copy of Pagan Babylon. The *first* attempt at corrupting Divine truth, made by Nimrod and his rebellious countrymen at Babylon, again exists in all its original splendour, and mystery, at Rome. Pagan Rome, doubtless, derived her mythology, in common with all other heathen nations, from the Babylonian, or Chaldæan, Harlot; who, in a religious, as well as political sense, was called the Mother and Mistress of Nations; because she first set the example of mighty empires, and still more mighty apostacies. But by the lapse of ages, the system, as observed at Rome, was so obscured, as to have lost many, if not most, of its originally distinctive features; and it was, in common with the idolatries of mankind in general, but a confused mass of worthless and chaotic error, scarcely regarded by the intelligent, and only respected by the ignorant in times of distress or perplexity. Papal Rome has, however, so far revived in her system all the peculiar characteristics of the ancient Chaldæan Harlotry (which was a corruption of original truth), as to earn for herself the title "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and of the abominations of the earth."

The Paganism of old Rome was so wide a departure from the Chaldean religion as not to be a recognizable offshoot of that idolatrous system; but the Papacy, in her pretence of Christianity, and by her acceptance of some of the chief doctrines of the Bible, in conjunction with a vast amount of heathenism, has really produced a wonderful restoration of that post-diluvian heresy, or harlotry, of Nimrod and his confederates in rebellion. Not a moral representation merely, but a material: not a copy of principles alone, but of practices; so that by bringing the two religions into juxtaposition, we shall find the one to be the similitude of the other. At this particular place, I must acknowledge the source whence I first derived my information concerning the actual identity of Pagan Babylon, and Papal Rome; and if, by thus drawing attention to a little tract, or pamphlet, of superlative worth, I can aid in extending its circulation, I shall be heartily glad; for, with some exceptions, I can most sincerely recommend its contents to all who care to be enlightened as to the true character and aims of the Papacy. "The Moral Identity of Babylon and Rome," by the Rev. Alexander Hislop,* is indeed at once both curious, and instructive. It forcibly illustrates the old proverb, that "truth is stranger than fiction," and contains an amount of evidence touching the abominations of the Roman Catholic Church, marvellous to contemplate.

The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as first intimated in Genesis,—where two persons of the triune Jehovah are *distinctly* mentioned ("the Word," and "the Spirit"), and the third person *not indistinctly* shadowed forth, (the very name of God, "Elohim," being in the plural number of a language that has *three* numbers, singular, dual, and plural),—was, it appears, adopted by the Chaldee Heresiarchs, though in a corrupted form, and imitated also by the Papacy:—

THE LITERAL BABYLON.

THE ancient Babylonians recognised the doctrine of a trinity, or three persons in one god—as

THE MYSTICAL BABYLON.

THE Church of Rome also, quite naturally as we might suppose, believes in a trinity; but

* Published by James Nisbet & Co.; price *Sixpence* only.

appears from a composite god with three heads forming part of their mythology, and the use of the equilateral triangle, also, as an emblem of such trinity in unity.

Dr. Rawlinson, in his admirable History of the Ancient Monarchies, particularly notices the system of triads, or Trinity, as a special feature of Babylonian worship, and in one sentence he strongly favours the notion of co-equal power:—"The great gods are viewed habitually rather as a hierarchy of co-equal powers, than as united by ties, implying on the one hand pre-eminence, and on the other subordination."—Vol. I., 142.

The triads of Babylon, Dr. Rawlinson seems to intimate, were all male deities; but Mr. Hislop explains the Babylonian triune God to consist of—

The Eternal Father,

The Spirit of God incarnate in a human mother,

A Divine Son, the fruit of that incarnation. (Page 10).

And this author likewise affirms that the title of Diune (from whence Diana), or the Dove, was intended to identify the woman with the spirit of all grace, that brooded dove-like over the deep at the creation.

that she should adopt a three-headed figure (as in some of her churches—the Monastery of the so-called Trinitarians at Madrid to wit), and an equilateral triangle, to express that belief, savours too strongly of the Babylonian Harlot to escape detection. Moreover, the Papal Trinity seriously, and practically, differs greatly from the Trinity of Scripture; since, though Rome may theoretically retain the person of the Holy Spirit in her creed, yet practically she transfers all His offices and functions to the Mother of God, and her Trinity thus becomes—

God the Father,

God the Son,

Mary the Mother of God the Son.

Indeed, if the Holy Spirit still enters into the Romish faith, I cannot see where her Trinity any longer exists, since by making Mary immaculate they have proclaimed her a goddess; no longer a saint, a glorified woman, but possessing in her own right divine attributes.—The true Christian draws near to Christ by the aid of the "Comforter." The Papist approaches Him, on the other hand, through the intercession of the Virgin.

It is in the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome, however, that we find her greatest, and chief, resemblance to the ancient Chaldean religion, that was established first on the plains of Shinar. The Gospel describes Mary the mother of Jesus as blessed *among* women, whilst the Papal doctrine is that she is blessed *above* women; and in setting up an immaculate woman as an object of worship, the Papacy follows, not the teaching of Christ, but the devices of Babylon.

THE LITERAL BABYLON.

THE Chaldeans worshipped a Queen of heaven—a great goddess—mother of the gods, called *Mulita*, or *Emuta* (the Lady), *Alma Mater*, or *Virgin Mother*; and she is represented in Babylonian sculpture with an infant in her arms.

The prominence of this female worship by the Babylonians seems remarkably well attested. Writing of this goddess (supposed to be *Semiramis*, mother of *Ninus*, or *Nimrod*) under the name of *Beltis*, Dr. Rawlinson says: "She is far more than the mere female power of *Bel Nimrod*, being in fact a separate and very important deity. Her common title is, 'the great goddess.' In Chaldee her name was *Mulita*, or *Emuta*, both words signifying 'The Lady.' Her favourite title was 'The Mother of the Gods,' or 'The Mother of the great Gods.' She was at once

THE MYSTICAL BABYLON.

THE Roman Church likewise worships a queen of heaven, "the Mother of God," called also "Our Lady," "*Alma Mater*," or "*Virgin Mother*;" and she is almost invariably represented with a child in her arms.

The *Virgin Mary* is, indeed, the most conspicuous object of worship in the Church of Rome. Statues and statuettes of this goddess crowd her buildings, both public and private. Pictures of *Madonnas*, some of whom shed artificial tears, are made to minister to the sensual aspirations of her worshippers. And what of all this idolatry is to be found in the Bible? Literally nothing!—but the whole wickedness is clearly traceable to rebellious Babylon. With an ingenious sophistry—peculiar to all heresies—the Church of Rome professes to deny that the worship

the Queen of heaven," &c.—
Vol. II., 151.

No doubt the promise of God to our first parents after the fall, that the seed of the woman (Isha) should bruise the head of the serpent, suggested to Nimrod the counterfeit system he is supposed to have set up at Babylon.

The idolatrous systems of the world—all derived from ancient Chaldæa—have this female worship also prominently developed: *Isis* (the Woman) in Egypt; *Demeter* (great Mother) in Greece; *Shing Moo* (holy Mother) in China; *Cybele* (known to the Romans as *Domina*) in Asia Minor; *Diana* (the Dove) at Ephesus,—all immaculate women, associated with immaculate sons—well attest the origin and meaning of so huge a counterfeit.

Next after "the Woman," in the pantheon of Papal Rome, comes the "Son God"—the Woman's seed; and although professed to be Jesus Christ, our blessed and adorable Saviour, we search the Scriptures in vain for his character and office, as explained by the Church of Rome—and only discover a true resemblance when we scan the infamous creed of Babylon, where the son appears to have been worshipped through the mother. The Christ of Rome Papal, therefore, agrees much more closely with the Christ of Chaldæa than with the "Christ of God."

THE LITERAL BABYLON.

THE MYSTICAL BABYLON.

IN the Babylonian faith there THE Church of Rome worships

was undoubtedly an immaculate son of an immaculate mother; and his various titles prove how deeply versed were these ancients in the great primary doctrine of salvation through an incarnate God. This Chaldæan Saviour was known as Zero-ashta (the seed of the woman), Zoro-ades (the only seed), El-bar (God the son), Ala-gabal (God the redeemer). Other names of this same god again identify him with the renowned Nimrod, or Ninus,—as Bar Cush (Bacchus), &c.

In another, and highly important, particular, we shall likewise discover a remarkable parallel between the Papacy, and that original idolatry, from which, according to God's Word, she really derived her system. I allude to her form of government, and the religious orders of her communion. If Christianity, as enunciated by Jesus and His apostles, gives especial instructions on one portion of Church administration, more than another, it is in the total abolition of all priestly functions, and human mediation: introducing the souls of mankind direct to their Saviour; and, whilst demanding for the husbandmen of the Divine vineyard, all possible esteem and love, for their works' sake, declares them to be servants, rather than lords over God's heritage. Does the Church of Rome follow this teaching of the Holy Scripture? If not, what does she profess? and whence the model she almost intuitively copies?

THE LITERAL BABYLON.

"THE Assyrians, it is probable, generally approached the gods through their priests; and it would seem to be these priests who are represented upon the

THE MYSTICAL BABYLON.

PRIESTLY mediation is a famous practice of the Church of Rome, and nothing scarcely can be accomplished in her religious system without priestly inter-

cylinders as introducing worshippers to the gods, dressed themselves in long robes, and with a curious mitre upon their heads."—Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*, Vol. II., 275.

"The priest always intervenes between the worshippers and the deities."—Vol. II., 462. Throughout the heathen world, likewise, the priestly caste affects to dominate both rulers and people.

The Chaldaean system of Harlotry was governed chiefly by a "Pontifex Maximus," or sovereign High Priest; and it is even affirmed that he went by the title of Peter—which name, in Chaldee, signifies "the Interpreter," or explainer of the mysteries. It is moreover quite certain that in Pagan Rome there was a Peter, and that several of the Roman deities carried keys, as emblems of their power to unravel the mysteries of the gods. Janus and Cybele, for example, had such keys. The key is also widely known as a Pagan emblem.

vention, in some shape or another. Papists confess to priests their innermost thoughts and convictions. They obtain from priests pardon and absolution for their sins. They hardly dare read the Scriptures without the sanction and aid of their priests—who thus exercise over the minds of their congregations, an influence neither encouraged nor sanctioned by Christianity; but quite in keeping with the ancient practices of Babylon.

The Roman Harlotry, as all well know, is governed by a sovereign High Priest, or Pontiff, who ever represents himself as the successor of St. Peter the apostle; and holds two keys, emblems of the power to open and shut heaven at his pleasure. It is said that the veritable statue of Jupiter is worshipped as that of St. Peter, at Rome. Certainly, nothing contained in the New Testament gives the slightest countenance to any such assumption of power as that exercised by the Pope; and certainly there is no mention of any Pope, or of St. Peter's supremacy amongst the apostles. But we find the substance of these Papal shadows in the long-buried records of Babylon.

In Pagan Rome, following the example of Babylon, that great antitype of all spiritual abominations, there was a college, or council of Pontiffs, who, under the presidency, or sovereignty, of the Pontifex Maximus, governed and regulated the affairs of their idolatrous system.

The highest orders of the Babylonian Priesthood were bound to a life of celibacy, and it was the same with the priests of Bacchus, in Pagan Rome; and this Bacchus being none other than Bar Cush (son of Cush) or Nimrod—whom the Babylonians are thought to have worshipped as their Messiah, the “Seed of the Woman,”—the practice clearly originated with the Chaldæans.

The tonsure, or shaven crown—emblematical of the Babylonian Messiah, the *sun* god—

In Papal Rome, there is a college, or conclave, of Cardinals, who superintend the affairs of that Church, under the presidency of the Pope. We seek in vain for any such infallible circle in the New Testament; but between the Cardinals of the Church of Rome, and the Pontiffs of the Babylonian Harlot, there is a resemblance rather more than accidental. The word Cardinal is supposed to be derived from *Cardinis*—a hinge; and as the Pagans of old Rome had a god of doors and *hinges*—Janus, the opener and shutter—the origin of this Cardinal circle of infallibles seems pretty clearly developed.

The Clergy of the Church of Rome,—contrary to the example and precepts of Apostles and Saints—are professed celibates. Thus, again, does that Church harmonise her system with the mock religion of Babylon, and justify the analogy so strongly determined in the Word of God.

Rome has adopted for her Priests the shaven crown, in conformity to the practice of her real pro-

has been universally borrowed by all heathen systems from their Chaldean mother. Priests of Isis, in Egypt; Buddhists, in India; Priests of Bacchus, at Rome; and many others, all adopted this singular custom.

It would appear further, that the Babylonian religion had connected with it, a class of ascetics, who professed to live apart from the rest of mankind, in spiritual harmony and devotion; and this institution was especially associated with the worship of their Madonna, or "Queen of Heaven," who counted amongst her worshippers a great body of monks and nuns. In Thibet and Japan—where the Chaldean heresy was probably introduced at a very early period—monasteries and nunneries are still to be found, and with the same disastrous results to morals as in Papal Europe.

If I reflect on Papal Rome's gorgeous ceremonial, and the sensual nature of her worship—the music—the dresses—the incense—the flowers, &c.,—I am reminded, not of the early and apostolic Church—nor of those Churches which *really* belong to the Shepherd of Israel—but of the Pagan ritual of ancient Babylon; and I cannot do better than quote again some evidence from "The Ancient Monarchies:"—"The sensuous cast of the religion naturally led to pompous ceremonial, a fondness for processional display and the use of magnificent vestments. These

totip; and when it is recollected that God forbids His people to make themselves bald (Lev. xxi., 5), doubtless by reason of its being an ancient idolatrous custom—the proof is the greater, that Papal Rome is mystically the Mother of abominations.

The Church of Rome is largely encumbered with the various orders which compose her secular clergy; and the religious houses—as the monasteries and nunneries are called—until suppressed by kings, or by the onward march of revolution, have ever been a pest and a nuisance to the localities surrounding them. What are nuns, but "vestal virgins?" and where, in the Old or New Testament, are such damsels introduced with sanction? The alternative is obvious: they come originally from Babylon.

last are represented with great minuteness in the Nimrod sculptures." The dresses of those engaged in sacred functions seem to have been elaborately embroidered]: ["Armlets, bracelets, necklaces, and ear-rings were worn by the officiating priests, whose heads were either encircled with a richly-ornamented fillet, or covered with a mitre, or high cap, of imposing appearance. Musicians had a place in the procession, and accompanied the religious ceremonies with playing or chanting, or in some instances possibly with both." (Vol. II., 278). Two features of this Babylonian service are especially noticeable as taking a prominent place in the ritualism of Rome: the processions and the chanting. The Pope's two-horned mitre is supposed to be the identical mitre, or head-dress, of the Babylonian god, Dagon,—whilst his crosier is derived equally from a Chaldean source, as extant monuments of Nimrod, and his successors, unquestionably prove.

Even the feasts of the Romish Church are evidently of Pagan, not of Christian origin, and one is astonished at the impudent audacity of a church so corrupted, claiming for herself the sole rights and privileges of Apostolical succession. The four leading festivals of the Papal Church are, Christmas-day—Lady-day—Easter-day, and the Assumption—and these, it would appear, are really of Babylonian origin. Christmas-day was not known until the fourth century, and as the exact date of our Saviour's birth remained altogether *uncertain*, the time of this particular feast was clearly mere guess work; unless derived from some other circumstance quite foreign to the nativity of our Lord—and just so it is, for I learn that long before Christ's birth, a festival was celebrated among the heathen, about the time of the winter solstice "in honour of the birth of the Son of the Babylonian Queen." Lady-day, the second feast of this Church, was also, it appears, observed by Pagan Rome in honour of Cybele, "the mother of the Babylonian Messiah." Her common title in Rome being "Domina" (the Lady), whence Lady-day. Easter follows next—and here, the very name betrays the true meaning of the feast, being a word of Chaldee origin. "Easter," alias *Ishta*, *Ashta*, or *Astárte* (the woman). Easter,

as now celebrated by the Roman Church, with its carnivals and six weeks Lent, was unknown, even at Rome, till so late as about the middle of the sixth century. But a feast, preceded by a forty days fast, seems to have been observed in ancient times by the Heathen world; as in Egypt, also to this day by the Yezidis of Kurdistan, and Mr. Hislop evidently thinks this feast had some reference to the commemorative weepings in honour of Tammuz. Lastly, there is the feast of the Assumption, observed by the Church of Rome in commemoration of the ascension of the Virgin into heaven, uncorrupted either in body or soul—and, as Mr. Hislop remarks: “It is impossible for the priests of Rome to find one shred of countenance for such a doctrine in Scripture. But in the Babylonian system the fable was ready made to their hand. There it was taught that Bacchus went down to hell, rescued his mother from the infernal powers, and carried her with him in triumph to heaven. The festival of the assumption in the Romish Church is held on the 25th of August. The festival of the assumption of the Chinese Madonna, as shown by Sir J. P. Davics, is likewise celebrated in the month of August.”

I might pursue the analogy much further, and with far greater minuteness, did time permit; but I think sufficient evidence has been adduced to show us wherein that wonderful identity really exists, between Pagan Babylon, and Papal Rome, which the Apocalypse reveals. If, however, from my necessary curtailment of this most interesting enquiry, any should be disposed to cast aside the testimony, as inconclusive, I entreat them not to hastily dismiss the subject from their minds, but to read other works on the question under consideration, and particularly to study the Bible, in which, be it recollected, we have God’s own recognition of the fact, that Babylon was the great mother of all spiritual Harlotry, and that the false Church established at Rome, He foresaw would be but a second development of the old snare.

Some close resemblance *there must be* between ancient Chaldæa, and modern Papal Rome to justify the titles given to the latter of “Babylon the great,” &c. Most commentators have felt this

necessity, and some have sought for the parallelism in the fancied geographical and topographical correspondence of the two localities, Babylon and Rome—in the walls of the respective cities, and the abundant use of bricks in their various structures. This is, however, so weak an attempt to discover the true fulfilment of Prophecy, as to be hardly worth notice, since between Rome and Babylon, whether as regards site, soil, or buildings, there is substantially no analogy whatever. Another view finds the resemblance in the historical associations of the two places, and here doubtless very much of direct analogy could be easily traced; but then, it would be but as between Pagan *secular* Babylon, and Pagan *secular* Rome—and not touch the Papacy (the Church) at all; and consequently I need not look for any parallels in this direction.

Remembering that it is between Papal Rome, (after the chief temporal power and glory of the Roman Empire had departed) as a Church, and Pagan Babylon as an idolatrous Harlot, that the resemblance is to be traced, I think my readers will very clearly see the consistency of the remarkable identity which this section unfolds, between the two systems, on matters solely affecting religion. It was a false *church*, the apostle saw in vision, seated at Rome, the great city that *then* reigned over the kings of the earth, and bearing so great a resemblance to the ancient *Chaldean* heresy, as to justify the titles, “Mystery—Babylon the great—the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth.” As a fulfilment of this vision we have the Papacy, a false Christian Church established at Rome, possessing religious characteristics closely corresponding with the corrupt and wicked perversion of divine truth first established at Babylon.

Section Third.

LOCALITY OF THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE.

THE PROPHECY.

“The seven heads are SEVEN MOUNTAINS, on which the WOMAN sitteth.”—Rev. xvii., 9.

“And the WOMAN which thou sawest is that *great City* which reigneth over the kings of the earth.”—Rev. xvii., 18.

THE FULFILMENT.

IN the foregoing Prophetical announcements, concerning the locality of the false Church that was to rise up and deceive mankind, there is a degree of perspicuity, almost without parallel. Two short verses exhibit to our minds plainly, and convincingly, an ecclesiastical system, centred in some mighty city, built on seven hills. Such, at least, is the most obvious translation of the passages; and just as the Papacy is found to correspond with the predicted Harlot Church, in faith, and practices, so, in this feature of locality, the evidence of their identity is equally, if not more substantially, exact. Some few writers have endeavoured, very vainly, to controvert the strong assumption that Rome is the signified locality of the vision; by statements, to the effect, that Constantinople, and Jerusalem, both occupy a seven-hilled site. But, apart from the total inapplicability of those cities to the general subject of the Prophecy, the facts themselves are not supported by any sufficient evidence to render them deserving of notice in our enquiry. To St. John the angel's remark about seven mountains was

doubtless singularly pertinent, and it must at once have directed his thoughts, without the least hesitation, to the Roman Capital, which was actually built on seven distinct hills, or mountains, and the fact even made a subject of allegorical application by the people of the Empire, one hundred years, at least, before the Apocalypse was written.

The primary group of structures which received the name of Roman City, was erected on the PALATINE HILL. Its first extension took place when the Sabines united themselves to the people of Romulus, and for whose accommodation the QUIRINAL HILL was enclosed. A still further addition was made to the city by the followers of Cœles Vibenna (an Etruscan), who built themselves habitations on the CÆLIAN HILL. Tullus Hostilius, after the destruction of Alba, added the VIMINAL HILL. The addition made by Ancus Martius, which was regarded as especially plebeian in character, was called the AVENTINE HILL. And in the reign of the first Tarquin, Rome was further enlarged by the ESQUILINE HILL, and the CAPITOLINE HILL,—making the total number SEVEN: for which the City became so celebrated, as we learn from the Roman poets and early Christians:—

“Sed quæ de *septem* totum circumspicit orbem
Montibus, imperii Roma Deûmque locus.”

OVID, Lib. I. El. v. 69.70.

[But she who looks round upon the whole world from her *seven mounts*, Rome the seat of empire, and of the gods.]

“Dumque suis victrix septem de montibus orbem
Prospiciet domitum, Martia Roma leget.”

OVID, Lib. III. El. vii. 51.52.

[And so long as martial Rome conquering shall look forth upon the subject world from her *seven mounts*.]

“Dis, quibus *septem* placuere *colles*.”

HORACE,—Carmen Seculum, Stanzas ii.

[Ye gods who have pleasure in the *seven hills*.]

“*Septem urbs alta jugis*, toti quæ præsidet orbi.”

PROPERTIUS, Lib. III. El. xi. 57.

[That city high built upon *seven summits*, which commands the whole world.]

“Rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma,
Septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces.”

VIRGIL, *Georg.* II., 535.

[Rome became the most beautiful of things (existing), and enclosed *seven heights* in her wall (herself remaining) one.]

“Carpite nunc tauri de *septem montibus* herbas.”

TIBULLUS, II., v. 55.

[Pluck now ye bulls, grass from the *seven mounts*.]

“Defendere tecta

Dardana et in *septem* discurrere jusserat arces.”

SILIUS ITALICUS, xii., 606.

[Had bidden to defend the Trojan abodes, and that they should branch out over *seven hills*.]

“*Septem montibus* admovere Baias.”

STATIUS, *Silv.* iv., iii. 26.

[To bring Baiæ close to the *seven hills*.]

“Hinc *septem* dominos videre montes,

Et totam licet æstimare Roman.”

MARTIAL, iv., lxiv. 11.

[Hence you may see the *seven royal hills*, and prize the whole of Rome.]

“Aurea *septem-geminas*,

Roma coronet arces.”—CLAUDIUS, xii., 19.

[(Let!) golden Rome crown her *seven sister heights*.]

“Divûm favore cum puer Mavortius

Fundaret arcem *septicollem* Romulus.”

PRUDENTIUS de Romano Martyre, 411.

[When the young child of Mars—Romulus—was founding the *seven-hilled stronghold*.]

Such is the testimony of Rome's Pagan poets; and the Christian Tertullian, speaks with equal plainness. He says:—“I appeal to the citizens of Rome, the populace that dwell on *seven hills*.”

TERTULLIAN, *Apol.* 35.

In the British Museum, likewise, there is an ancient medal, or coin, representing Imperial Rome as sitting, or reclining, on the *seven hills*,—(figured in ELLIOT, Vol. IV., p. 39).

With such historical evidence, can any man doubt the application, or fulfilment, of this vision vouchsafed to the believing

John, the beloved disciple? Rome was Pagan at that time. Temples to the idol gods crowded the hill-tops of the far-famed capital. Her glory, her very shame. Her power put forth to crush in terrible cruelty that rising Church, which was destined, first to triumph in gospel purity, and then, alas! subsequently to fall away again, and become practically Pagan, a second time. All this must have crowded with overpowering force into the mind of the venerable exile—Pagan Rome! Christian Rome! Papal Rome!—in rapid succession. No wonder he marvelled with great astonishment, thus attracting the notice of the heavenly messenger, who, thereupon, proceeded to unravel the mystery. And ought not we modern Christians to marvel at the merciful interposition of our Good Shepherd, who has thus warned His sheep from seeking shelter and pasture, in such a treacherous fold as the Church of Rome? Never before had Satan worked up a system of fraud so successfully: never had truth been so hypocritically employed as a bait to allure our unsuspecting souls to certain destruction. And never was a Prophetic warning more plain, and distinct; so leaving without excuse, or palliation, those erring souls, who, infatuated with the sensualities of the fallen Church of Rome, still cling to her ungodly communion.

Besides the testimony already alleged concerning Rome as the seven-hilled city, that great fact is further proved by the sort of national festival held there, called "the festival of the seven mountains" (Septimontium), as though to clench the application of God's prophecy, touching Papal Rome, with iron tenacity. I must not here omit to notice, also, the *extraordinary fact* that, even now, Rome is designated by both lay and ecclesiastical members of the Papal Church, "the City of the seven hills." In an address of Italians to the French Emperor shortly after the Italian War occurred these singular words. "*It is from the top of the SEVEN HILLS,*" &c.; and Cardinal Rauscher of Vienna, in a pastoral letter fulminated against Piedmont, in 1864, remarked: "The Papal States which have already begun the twelfth century of their existence in the political world, have not escaped the changes of time. More than once, they seemed

to waver on the brink of perdition, and, at one time, not much above fifty years since, a powerful conqueror wholly embodied them with his dominions. Nevertheless the hand of the Lord was with them. The tempest ceased to rage, conquerors fell, and round the CITY OF THE SEVEN HILLS were gathered again the regions Providence assigned to the successor of the Prince of Apostles, etc.—Given at Vienna, on the fête of St. Martha, July 29, 1864. JOSEPH OTTMAR.

Think you, reader, do these men study the Apocalypse of St. John? What explanation can be given of that persistent obstinacy which refuses to discern the lineaments, characteristics, and locality of their own Church, so unmistakably revealed in God's word? If a true Church, this Roman system would quickly turn and repent; but, as a false Church, a political Church, a sensual Church, she has other objects to gain than the truth, and, faithful to such an unholy aim, she closes her eyes to the warnings of God—shuts up the word of God, makes it void by tradition, and is wholly gone after her idols.

Clear, and unmistakeable, as was the emblematical prophecy of the locality of this church, (for it should be especially remembered that Rome was, even in the Apostles' day, called the SEVEN HILLED CITY) yet we find the angel making assurance doubly sure, and at the conclusion of his description of "the mystery of the woman and of the Beast which carrieth her," leaving all metaphor, and disguise, he satisfies the amazement and astonishment of the Apostle, by telling him in plain unfigurative words "the woman which thou sawest, is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth," or, in other words, "the corrupt Church of the future which you have just been permitted to see, shall have her seat at the imperial city of Rome." There was but one power in the world when the visions of the Apocalypse were vouchsafed to St. John. True to the ancient predictions of Daniel, the fourth, or Roman Empire, had proved itself "diverse from all kingdoms," had devoured the whole earth—trodden it down—and broken it in pieces (see Daniel vii.) To Rome all eyes were turned. From Rome all commands emanated.

By Roman nominees all kingdoms and states were governed. Even the Lord Jesus Christ could not be put to death and crucified, without the sanction of a Roman Governor. To be a Roman Citizen was a privilege coveted to the ends of the earth, which carried with it much positive advantage, as St. Paul found when about to be sacrificed to the malice of his Jewish countrymen. The decree for the Apostle's exile in Patmos was signed at Rome; and when the angel stood up, majestically pointing across the Mediterranean as he spoke the ominous words, "the woman that thou sawest is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth," how could the Apostle think of any other city? How can we, even in this present age, think of any other city? Search the page of history as we may, torture our brains as we will to escape from the iron evidence which thus confronts man's bold scepticism, there is no way of escape from this unearthly testimony of the truth and power of Christianity.

It was after this section of my subject had been written that my attention was drawn to a work entitled "Union with Rome" by Archdeacon Wordsworth, and I eagerly procured it, hoping to gather from such an author evidences of a superior and unquestionable character; but alas! I was greatly disappointed on finding the learned Doctor following on in the well-beaten pathway of his ecclesiastical predecessors; still calling the Pope, the Beast and the Antichrist; still confounding the woman with the beast, on which she rides; and, in consequence, failing to render such an interpretation as could be accepted by any careful student of the Apocalypse. With one portion of this little book, however, I was much delighted; it was that portion relating to the evidence concerning the seven hilled city, being none other than Rome, for, as Dr. Wordsworth sums up, "There is scarcely a Roman Poet of any note, who has not spoken of Rome as a city seated on seven mountains. Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, Silius Italicus, Statius, Martial, Claudian, Prudentius, in short the unanimous Voice of Roman Poetry during more than five hundred years, beginning with the age of St. John, proclaimed Rome as the seven hilled city."

Section Fourth.

THE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE, A POLITICAL CHURCH.

THE PROPHECY.

“The Great Whore that sitteth upon many waters, with whom the *kings of the earth have committed fornication.*”—Rev. xvii., 1, 2.

“And the waters, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.”—Rev. xvii., 15.

“And the *kings of the earth have committed fornication with her.*”—Rev. xviii., 3.

“And I saw a Woman sit upon a *scarlet coloured beast.*”—Rev. xvii., 3.

“I will tell thee the mystery of the Woman and of the *beast* that carrieth her. *The beast* that thou sawest *was, and is not.* And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And *the beast* that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven.”—Rev. xvii., 7, 8, 10, 11.

THE FULFILMENT.

THE Harlot Church seated on the seven hills, is described in the preceding verses, first, as exercising an almost unbounded domination (sitting upon *many waters*); secondly, as having a close political relationship (committing fornication) with the kings of the earth—the ten kings, doubtless, of the Latin Empire, for it is to these alone that we are referred by the prophecies of Daniel, and St. John; and thirdly, this Church is seen, at a particular period of her existence, to be specially allied with, and dependent upon, the eighth or revived seventh head of the Latin Empire: “the Beast that was, and is not, and yet is,”—described emphatically, as “the Beast that carrieth her.”

We have simply to look into the pages of European history, to discover how closely the Church of Rome corresponds, politically,

with the great and mystical Babylon of the Revelation; and how supremely terrestrial, and sublunary, has been her career all along the centuries of her existence. It was by the favour and indulgence of a Roman Emperor, that the Priestly power of Rome first had opportunity to display its proud pretensions; and from the moment when Gregory the Second issued peremptory decrees from his ecclesiastical throne, down to our own day, the Papacy has coquetted with the kings and rulers of the earth, just as she could best serve her own infamous purposes and plans. And they—infatuated with the harlot's wiles—have been nothing loth to do her abominable behests; pleased with the flattery, and not slow to avail themselves, in turn, of such spiritual influence of their cunning mistress, as they thought might increase, or consolidate their own power and glory.

But although the Roman Church is political, in the sense that the mundane affairs of the various States receive attention from her aspiring priesthood—who have ever vainly sought to wield all the actual power of the Roman world—yet it must not for one moment be imagined, that she ever really possessed sufficient temporal force of her own to render applicable to her the biblical emblem of a “Wild Beast;” which is only used in Scripture, to denote great Empires, or aggregations of States, such as those, over which Sovereigns like Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander, Nero, Charlemagne, or Napoleon, have ruled.

Dr. Robertson in his “View of the State of Europe,” most distinctly affirms that the territorial power of the Church of Rome, at its best, was but a shadow; he says:—“As Rome had so long been the seat of Empire, and the capital of the world, its bishops were, on that account, entitled to respect; they received it; but during several ages they received, and even claimed, nothing more. From these humble beginnings, they advanced with such adventurous and well directed ambition that they established a *spiritual dominion* over the minds and sentiments of men; to which all Europe submitted with implicit obedience. Their claim of universal jurisdiction, as heads of the Church, and the pretensions to infallibility in their decisions, as

successors of St. Peter, are as chimerical as they are repugnant to the genius of the Christian religion. But on these foundations the superstition and credulity of mankind enabled them to erect an amazing superstructure. In all *ecclesiastical* controversies their decisions were received as the infallible oracles of truth. Nor was the plenitude of their power confined solely to what was spiritual; they dethroned monarchs; disposed of crowns; absolved subjects from the obedience due to their sovereigns; and laid kingdoms under interdicts. There was not a state in Europe which had not been disquieted by their ambition. There was not a throne which they had not shaken; nor a Prince who did not tremble at their power. Nothing was wanting to render this empire absolute, and to establish it on the ruins of all civil authority, but that the Popes should have possessed such a degree of *temporal power*, as was sufficient to second and enforce their spiritual decrees. Happily for mankind, at the time when their spiritual jurisdiction was most extensive and most revered their *secular* dominion was *extremely limited*. They were powerful Pontiffs, formidable at a distance; but they were petty princes, without any considerable domestic force."

Afterwards, this historian proceeds to notice the efforts made to procure territory, with some amount of success—but he adds, "the power of the Popes did not increase in proportion to the extent of territory which they had acquired," and gives as a reason, the feudal influence of the Roman Barons, who constantly disputed the Pope's authority, and at times almost annihilated it—"even in Rome itself." Only once, during the Pontificate of Alexander VI, had the Papacy any real pretensions to be considered a secular power; and that was of short duration, and too limited in extent to constitute an Empire.

I think the manifestly impartial evidence of this historian, will be sufficient for the purpose of proving that the Papacy never was, either historically, or prophetically, one of the heads of the Roman or Latin, Wild Beast; but that her widespread influence was solely derived from her assumed *priestly* supremacy. Hence, I can only regard the false system as a

“woman” or Church, and not as a “Beast” or Empire; all her real political authority having sprung from her spiritual, and not from any temporal power.

The details of history, amply corroborate this view of the subject, for whenever Rome Papal had any work to accomplish, her schemes were always dependent, for their success, on the temporal arm, or aid, of the secular sovereigns with whom she coquetted. Unable to draw strength from God, whose ways she had corrupted, she turned to Egypt for help, and relied, literally on chariots and horses to sustain her iniquitous power over the peoples, under her spiritual sway; thus, in prophetic language, committing fornication with the kings of the earth.

I might mention, as another very conclusive testimony against the idea of the Popes collectively constituting one of the heads of the Latin Empire, the striking fact that they were continually crowning “Emperors of the Romans” with their own hands. Thus Pope Leo III. crowned Charlemagne, and as he put a precious crown upon the head of this sovereign, the dome of St. Peter’s resounded with the acclamations “Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus crowned by God the great and pacific Emperor of the Romans.” The Emperor Henry III. was crowned by Pope Clement the III. as the legitimate successor of Augustus and Charlemagne; this same Pope being consecrated in the Lateran, chief of religion by the Emperor’s influence. The Emperors of Germany, styled “Emperors of the most Holy Roman Empire,” were always crowned by the Popes, until after Frederick III. of Austria, the last crowned by the Pope in person on 18th March, 1450. The succeeding Emperors dispensing with the honour according to Gibbon, and deeming the religious sanction unnecessary to the consolidation of their power.

And is it not the fact that Rome’s fearful persecutions, have all of them been concocted with one or other of the kings of the nations, professing allegiance to her communion? Harken to the direct and bold appeal of the Woman to her Paramours, challenging them to carry out her behests, to do her work of fury, and even to quench all opposition to her authority in

blood. "The 4th Council of the Lateran enjoined all rulers as they desired to be esteemed faithful, to swear a public oath that they would labour earnestly, and to the full extent of their power, to exterminate from their dominions all those who were branded as heretics by the church." And let history give us the reply of the kings to this challenge, and show how fearfully, and relentlessly, they did the behests of this great Roman Harlot. It was in the year 1215, that the Roman Church issued the foregoing appeal, just seven years since the founding of the Inquisition, and for centuries afterwards, fiery persecutions against the saints of God, blazed out all over the territories of sovereigns decloyed by this Harlot's abomination.

Pepin committed fornication with the church of Rome when, with the connivance and assistance of Pope Zacharias, he usurped the power of another Monarch at Rome.

Charlemagne committed fornication with her when, after saving Pope Adrian I. from the power of Didier, King of the Lombards, he did homage to the Papacy at Rome, and used his secular power to coerce nations into submission to the Roman Church.

Philip the 4th, surnamed le Bel, committed fornication with the Church of Rome when he formed the so-called "diabolical bargain" with Clement V, by which that Pope agreed to gratify his pride and cupidity at the expense of the Church and the Knights Templars.

Francis I. committed spiritual fornication with this Church, when he carried out his violent persecutions against the Lutherans and Protestants, and even married his second son to the niece of a Pope, to strengthen his alliance with that Church.

Charles IX, committed whoredom with Rome, when he sanctioned the horrible massacre of St. Bartholomew, by which 30,000 Protestants were put barbarously to death; Pope Gregory XIII. receiving the intelligence with joy, and ordering cannon to be fired in honour of the event.

Louis XIV. evinced his sinful amours with the Church of Rome by suppressing the edict of Nantes, and inflicting untold suffering on the Protestants of his kingdom.

The Emperor Charles V. committed whoredom, when he received wages from the Roman Catholic Church for persecuting and extirpating Protestantism throughout Germany, Italy, and Spain.

The Parliament of Turin was bewitched by this Harlot's enchantments, when, at the solicitation of Pope Paul the third, they commenced the bitter persecutions against the Waldenses in the valley of Piedmont.

King John of England held adulterous intercourse with this Church, when he agreed to hold his dominions as feudatory of Rome by the annual payment of 1,000 marks, (700 for England, 300 for Ireland), and on bended knee swore fealty to the Pope in the person of the legate Pandolf.

Queen Mary of England, committed whoredom with Rome when, on her accession, she restored Roman Catholic worship, with all its idolatries, throughout the land, lighted the fires of Smithfield and so persecuted the Protestant people of the Lord, as to gain for herself the epithet, for all time, of "Bloody Mary."

James II., by his unwarrantable efforts to impose Roman Catholicism on the people of England, and by the re-establishment of the Court of Ecclesiastical Censure contrary to the laws, was likewise guilty of spiritual adultery with the Papacy.

Henry II. of France became entangled in the Harlots seductions when, after ordering legal proceedings to be taken against the Protestants of his kingdom, publicly declared he would "make the extirpation of the heretics his principal business."

Henry III. followed his predecessors accursed example, when promising to oppose heresy at the risk of his life said, "he could not find a prouder grave than amidst the ruins of heresy."

The King of Spain in 1478, fell a victim to the Harlot, when he, by an arrangement with the Pope re-established the Inquisition throughout his dominion.

Leopold II. of Austria was beguiled into spiritual fornication with Rome, when, at the instance of the Jesuits he permitted all the Protestant Ministers of Hungary to be shut up in dungeons, contrary to his coronation oath as head of that kingdom.

And in this enlightened 19th century, England has, by the

voice of a parliamentary majority, committed fornication with the Church of Rome, in removing from Romanism, step by step, all prohibitory restrictions, and encouraging the growth of her iniquitous teaching by the establishment of Maynooth at the national expense.

Francis Joseph of Austria was verily guilty of spiritual adultery with the great Whore, when he made the Concordat of 1855, which, as much as anything else, lost him his influence over Protestant Germany, and paved the way for that humiliation of his Empire by Prussia, which took place last year (1866).

But besides all this general coquetting with the kings of the earth, the false church was to stand in a very peculiar relationship, during her last moments, to the eighth head of the Apocalyptic Wild Beast; termed the "Beast that was, and is not, and yet is," upon whom she was literally to sit, in the sense of complete dependence.

Rome's great Empire, according to the word of prophecy, was to have seven heads, signifying seven distinct forms of polity, or government; and generally known as—1. Kings, 2. Consuls, 3. Dictators, 4. Decemvirs, 5. Military Tribunes, 6. Emperors; Crowned Democracy under Napoleon the first, constituting, as I believe, its seventh and last head, short lived. There is also a revival of the latter predicted, called an eighth head, "or the beast that was, and is not, and yet is," and this prophecy is supposed to have its wonderful fulfilment in Louis Napoleon, and the revived French Empire of which he is the chief. In one sense this remarkable Prince is the Beast (Empire) that was, since he *professes* his government to be a resurrection of his uncle's. In another sense, he *is not* the representative of his uncle, since he disclaims for ever all ideas of European conquest, and relies for fame on his moral ascendancy only; so that, territorially, he cannot be one of the heads of Rome's great Empire. But, suppose him to succeed in establishing a great European confederation, with himself recognised as its President, he will then most emphatically embody the enigma of the Revelation "The Beast that was, and is not, and yet is." (For special information on this marvellous resuscitation of Napoleonism see my "ANOMIA," and "THE SPEAKING IMAGE.")

Now it is upon this eighth head that the Roman Church is to sit in her last moments, and modern history immediately supplies us with the proofs we need in our process of identification; for ever since Louis Napoleon Buonaparte came into possession of power, he has maintained an Army of French Troops at Rome for the protection of the Papacy:—

In 1849 . .	19,185 men,	costing	2,029,000fr.
„ 1850 . .	13,777 „	„	7,822,000fr.
„ 1851 . .	10,198 „	„	5,423,000fr.
„ 1852 . .	9,858 „	„	5,291,000fr.
„ 1853 . .	8,784 „	„	4,950,000fr.
„ 1854 . .	9,358 „	„	5,962,000fr.
„ 1855 . .	6,940 „	„	4,316,000fr.
„ 1856 . .	5,423 „	„	3,082,000fr.
„ 1857 . .	5,600 „	„	2,946,000fr.
„ 1858 . .	5,628 „	„	2,936,000fr.
„ 1859 . .	7,404 „	„	3,787,000fr.
„ 1860 . .	7,000 „	„	3,500,000fr.
„ 1861 . .	19,000 „	„	9,480,000fr.

And this occupation was continued down to the year 1866; but I have not the statistics at hand to give. The sums mentioned above, do not represent the real total expense to France, as the arms and equipment of the troops are not included in the amount. Nor is this the only act of France, and her Emperor, that proves the dependence of the Church of Rome on the revived French Empire, and confirms the extraordinary “*entente*” existing between two such opposite and contradictory systems.

It was mainly by the aid of the Priests, and the Papal party, that Louis Napoleon gained such an overwhelming support from the people of France, when soliciting their suffrages on behalf of a restoration of the Empire. What strange infatuation must have taken possession of that miserable hierarchy, to induce it so effectually to play into the hands of its enemies. Afraid of revolution, and trembling in expectation of fresh excesses, how could the Papacy expect to escape the clutches of so bitter a foe, by crowning and consolidating its influence? Did she hope by fondly caressing the monster, to ride securely on his back?

Did she imagine her artifices powerful enough to tame the "Wild Beast" from the bottomless pit so effectually, that, as of yore, she might control the secular powers of the earth, and still dominate mankind through the "sword of kings?" Did she contemplate the success of a far reaching democracy—powerful, persecuting, and vindictive; doing the behests of the Roman Harlot, and securing the supremacy of her spiritual fornications? All this is quite feasible, and indeed, for a few years her expectations had ample promise of fulfilment. Great was the cordiality of the amour between the crowned chief of Democracy, and the Woman of Rome; and there seemed hardly anything the Emperor of France would not grant to his Spiritual Mistress, if she would but forsake her old love of "Divine right," her Ultramontane affections, and her retrogressive predilections. Only think of an enlightened Sovereign of the 19th century, like Louis Napoleon, embracing such a dogma as that of the Immaculate Conception, at the bidding of Rome; what stronger proof of unwavering submission could he bestow? His soldiers surrounded the Pontiff's throne. His armies fought the Pontiff's battles. His authority recognised the Pontiff's dogmas. He boasted himself the Pontiff's champion, and the Pontiff called him Rome Papal's eldest son.

As I have already stated, for eighteen years French troops—the soldiers of the revolutionary Empire and dynasty—have propped up the personal influence, and splendour, of the Papal Sovereign; and when that great religious controversy sprang up concerning the possession of the keys of the Holy Places; when the Latin Church was in danger of losing her position of supremacy at Mount Zion; when the Greek Church, represented by Russia, threatened by force to deprive the Papacy of her lordly heritage of the keys; it was the Empire, and Emperor, of Revolution, who came forward and defied the might of the Russian aggressor. The Crimean war originated entirely in this dispute of the two Churches over the keys of the Holy Sepulchre. At the very commencement of the dispute, France espoused the claims, and backed the pretensions, of the Latin Church, and was sufficiently outspoken, by her representative, to confess this protection of Papal Rome as

the chief motive for her interference ; for, during some misunderstanding which arose between the French ambassador (Baraguay D'Hilliers) and the Porte, in the year 1854, he, on behalf of his country, distinctly stated that the demand he had made in favour of some Catholic Hellenes, was based on that protection of the Latin Church, which France and his Imperial master had always afforded. During, or immediately succeeding, the Crimean war, a pamphlet was published entitled "Diplomatic Mystifications and Popular Credulity," which very clearly and intelligently exposed the whole series of diplomatic blunders, and follies, committed by this country at the solicitation of France. In the pages of this work, I found the following additional testimony in proof, not only of the great moral and material support given to Papal Rome by the revived French Empire, but that all the Catholic powers of Europe, likewise, assented to, and sanctioned, this riding of the Papacy on Imperial France :—

"The Blue Books shew that 'all the Roman Catholic Powers of Europe seconded and supported the claims of France for the possession of the Sanctuaries, on the plea that it was a *Catholic question*, and Louis Lapoleon, by a public act, put his fleet in the Baltic under the protection of the Virgin ; and all the newspapers early in July contained a detailed account of Admiral Parseval Deschene's reception of her picture presented by the Emperor, of her inauguration as protectress of the fleet, and of the holiday granted the sailors on board all the French vessels.'"

"DIPLOMATIC MYSTIFICATIONS."

Thus did Louis Napoleon fight the battles of the Roman Church. Rome, indeed, went into action on the back of the Revolution ; and her nineteenth century dogma of the Immaculate Conception, was publicly accepted and acknowledged at the same time, by the representative hero of Free-thought, Infidelity, and Anti-Christianity. The Pope, moreover, was in every way contented and satisfied with his great supporter ; for when, in 1859, Louis Napoleon held his Congress, after the Italian war, the Pope, in an autograph letter to the Emperor, recognised this Sovereign as the power on whom he depended (rode), with peculiar emphasis :—

“In the autograph letter of the Pope to the Emperor, his Holiness declared that he is willing to be represented at the Congress, having full confidence in the loyalty and firmness of the eldest son of the Church, to whom God has intrusted the mission to protect the patrimony of St. Peter against illegal covetousness.”—*Daily Telegraph*, 19th Dec., 1859.

And since this period, the most unqualified recognitions of the same fact have been published from time to time. Thus the *Times* newspaper of 12th January, 1861, quoted from a work by M. de Laroche Jaquelin, the opinion of that writer on this most unnatural alliance:—

“The Emperor said to the King of Piedmont,—‘You have violated the laws of nations. I will defend Rome, and the patrimony of St. Peter;’ and he does so. ‘I am the eldest son of the Catholic Church. I am the successor of the Most Christian Kings. I will protect the independence of the Holy Father, who shall not be subservient to any Power on earth;’ and hitherto he has done so.”

But of all evidence, that which has recently and successively flowed from the Sovereign Pontiff’s own lips, must be considered the most conclusive and unanswerable.

On the 1st January, 1860, General Guyon presented the officers of the French Army of occupation to the Pope—whose reply, to a short address of the Generals, ran as follows:—

“In the last few years which have glided away, it was a subject of consolation, but in this year it is for me a double subject of consolation, to see the *French army take part in the exceptional position of the States of the Church*. The assurances of the devotion and of the love of this army are also a great source of consolation. I invoke the blessings of the good God upon the portion of the army which is here, and the whole army which is in the French Empire. But, prostrate, I pray the good God to bless the generous French nation; I prostrate myself at the feet of the God of Mercy, who is, and will be for ever, and ask Him to load with graces and knowledge the chief of that nation; that courage may be given him to condemn those perverse principles which cannot be in harmony with the Church, and which are a

monument of hypocrisy and of ignoble contradictions. I hope—nay, I am wrong—I am persuaded, that the Emperor will receive light from God to condemn those principles. I may add that I have some former documents in my hand which were sent me by him, and which are in contradiction to those principles. With this assurance I am convinced, and, with this condition, I bless him, I bless his august companion, the Imperial Prince, and the entire nation.”—*Daily Telegraph*, January 12, 1860.

In 1863, on a similar occasion (General Montebello then having command of the French troops), His Holiness said :—

“The French army is as distinguished in war for bravery, as in peace for discipline ; but it is still more distinguished because it *defends the Vicar on Earth of Christ, and Rome*, which is the city destined by Heaven for his abode—a fact sealed by the blood of innumerable martyrs. The French army is a blessed instrument in the hands of man to save the Church from revolution. It was the work of God that made it such. As God said to the sea, ‘Your waves shall advance so far and no farther,’ so the French army dictated its limits to the Italian revolution, ‘You shall advance so far, but you shall respect the Vicar of Christ and his city.’ Therefore, Rome and the Pope were respected.”—*Daily Telegraph*, January 9, 1863.

When the year 1866 commenced, with the prospect of a withdrawal of the French army before him, the Pope still more openly admitted his dependence on France for support and protection, in a species of helpless lamentation. He thus spoke :—

“I accept with pleasure the good wishes expressed by your general. As in previous years, I give you my apostolic benediction. I have been informed, and have repeatedly heard, that the French army is to leave Rome. It is therefore the last time that I shall have the satisfaction of giving you this benediction. I bestow it upon you, then, with all my heart, full of affection and love.

“I will remind you of what was said by the great apostle Paul—‘*Scio quoniam intrabunt post discessionem lupi rapaces,*’ . . . and, applying it to present circumstances, thus translate it—‘I know that after your departure the savage beasts will

enter.' Then I shall be like Jesus before ascending Golgotha, when he prayed in the garden of Gethsemane, and an angel came strengthening him. I am too miserable to be compared to Jesus Christ; yet I also shall pray to obtain consolation. I shall pray for poor Italy, which has been made an unhappy country, and has been precipitated into an abyss of misery, impiety, and irreligion. But I am departing from the subject before me. I shall pray for France, and for the whole French army, whom I esteem, and for the Imperial family. I shall pray for you all, to whom I owe so much. May God, therefore, God the Father, author of all good, bless you; may the Son, eternal wisdom of the Father, communicate to you that wisdom so necessary amid the difficulties of life; may the Holy Ghost, eternal love of the Father and the Son, inspire you with that love, so that you may love one another."—*Standard*, January 9, 1866.

Even when the last ties between the Emperor and the Papacy seemed about to be severed,—and in taking leave of the French troops on their actual departure from Rome,—the Pope reminded the soldiers that France is the eldest daughter of the Church, &c.:

"Before your departure I wish to bid you farewell. Your flag left France to restore the Holy See. On its departure it was accompanied by the unanimous good wishes of the nation. The flag returns now to France; but I believe that many consciences will not be satisfied. I wish it to be received in the same manner as when it left France, but I doubt whether this will be the case. There must be no illusions; the revolution will come to the gates of Rome. It has been said that Italy is complete. No, she is not complete: and if she exists as she is, it is because there remains this scrap of territory where I am still at the present time. When this no longer remains, the flag of the revolution will float over the Italian capital. To reassure me, attempts are made to persuade me that Rome, by the nature of its position, cannot be the capital of Italy. I am tranquil because I have confidence in the Divine protection. Go to France with my benediction. Let those who are able to approach the Emperor tell him that I pray for him and his, and for his tranquillity. But he also must do something.

France is the eldest daughter of the Church, but it does not suffice to wear the title—the right to wear it must be proved by deeds.” —Reported in *Daily Telegraph*, December 12, 1866.

That fiasco of the Garibaldians, just concluded, has again brought out France strongly in support of the Papacy, has again shown to the world that singular, and, to carnal reason, incomprehensible anomaly—“The Woman” sitting on “the Beast,” the “pro-religious” system protected by the “anti-religious” system—but all presently to be made intelligible by a most unexpected sequel.

The Papacy having itself, by the mouth of its Pope, admitted the great fact that she has been, and is, supported in a measure by Louis Napoleon Buonaparte, and his French army (“Soldiers of 1789 allies with the enemies of 1789”), thereby acknowledging the revived French democratic Emperorship to be the eighth head of the Apocalyptic “Wild Beast.” It will be well to take lip evidence from the other side, and to hear the Emperor’s own acknowledgment of the part he has been consciously performing in this wonderful drama of contemporaneous history.

A speech of His Imperial Majesty, reported in the *Morning Star* of 13th October, 1859, will, at one glance, supply the pith of the confession, and set all doubts at rest for ever; putting beyond question or denial, the fact, that for a series of years, the Mystical Woman—the Roman Babylon—has been resting for support on the Empire and Emperor of an apostate democracy, —the last and final piece of harlotry with the kings of the earth that this Church will ever commit—and thus, to the end of her existence, clinging to “earthly, sensual, and devilish” weapons for the maintenance of her cause:—

“The Emperor, in reply to the speech of the Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux, part of which alluded to the temporal power of the Pope, thanked his Eminence for having understood the high mission of the Emperor, by endeavouring to strengthen confidence in his good intentions, rather than to spread needless alarms.

“The Emperor expressed his hopes that a new era of glory would arise for the Church on the day when every one would

share his conviction that the temporal power of the Pope was not opposed to the liberty and independence of Italy.

“His Majesty further says that the Government which was the means of restoring the Holy Father to the Pontifical throne, would only give utterance to such respectful counsels as were dictated by sincere devotedness to the interests of his Holiness; but his Majesty could not but be alarmed about the day, which was not far distant, when Rome should be evacuated by the French troops; for Europe would not allow that the occupation of Rome by these troops, which had lasted for ten years, should be prolonged indefinitely.

“Should our army be withdrawn, what will it leave behind— anarchy, terror, or peace? These were questions the importance of which could not escape any one.

“At the present time, in order to resolve these questions, it was necessary, instead of appealing to the ardent passions of the people, to search with calmness for the truth, to pray to Providence to enlighten the people as well as the Sovereigns, upon the wise fulfilment of their rights, and that they might well understand their duties.”—*Morning Star*, October 13, 1859.

In 1860—at the opening of the French Legislative Assembly—the Emperor again alluded to his Papal mission:—“For the last eleven years, I have sustained *alone* at Rome the power of the Holy Father, without having ceased a single day to revere in him the sacred character of the chief of our religion.” And likewise in 1861, in another speech, he repeated the confession of his pro-Papal acts:—“At Rome, I have thought it necessary to augment the garrison, where the security of the Holy Father appeared to be menaced.”

Reader! has not the Roman Church dominated over many peoples, nations, and tongues? Has she not committed spiritual fornication with the kings of the earth? Has she not been riding, these fifteen years or more, on the back of Imperial, democratic France? The inference, then, is obvious: she *is* the Babylon of the Apocalypse.

Section Fifth.

THE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE—A PERSECUTING CHURCH.

THE PROPHECY.

“Because she *made* all nations drink of the wine of the *wrath* of her fornication.”—Rev. xiv., 8.

“And I saw the Woman drunken with the *blood* of the saints, and with the *blood* of the martyrs of Jesus.”—Rev. xvii., 6.

“For all nations have drunk of the wine of the *wrath* of her fornications.”—Rev. xviii., 3.

“And in her was found the *blood* of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth.”—Rev. xviii., 24.

THE FULFILMENT.

HAD the Church of Rome purposely endeavoured to assimilate her own characteristics to those embodied in the description given of the Harlot system in the Apocalypse of St. John, she could not have more accurately fulfilled, than she has done, all that is there predicted of her; and in no one particular is the resemblance so striking, as it is in reference to the persecution of the saints of God. In her efforts to propagate and maintain a false and devilish perversion of Divine truth, the Church of Rome has not relied for success on powers of persuasion, or on the credulity and ignorance of her converts, so much as on those secular and material forces, which have ever been employed, with an unsparring severity, to second the dark designs of her priestly will. She has, *literally*, compelled (made) all nations to drink of her cup; and the potion thus forced upon her victims, was well described to the apostle as *wrathful*. One of her Popes made the

boast, that whilst the Papacy was as gentle as a lamb to its friends, it was as strong as a lion to its adversaries; and this portentous declaration but represents, too faithfully, the un-governable, and despotic, cruelty of this Church towards those who have presumed to question her infallibility, or to forsake her Communion.

It was in the very earliest days of the Reformation—when sincere efforts after a return to primitive truth were manifesting themselves—that the iron and malicious grip of the Harlot Church of Rome was first felt, and she began to torment and slaughter the humble followers of the Lamb. Paganism had, as it were, but just ceased its persecution of the saints, when the spurious, or Pagano-Christian Church, took up the cudgels on behalf of man's great adversary, he who inspires those tender mercies of the wicked, which are cruel. Always glad of the extra evidence afforded by outside, and independent witnesses, I shall describe the pre-eminent position of the Church of Rome as a persecuting system, not in the language of any Protestant Divine, but in the cold, well-weighed words of a writer with Rationalistic tendencies; who, as may be supposed, would hardly prefer one positive creed to another, and scarcely admit one to be really worse than another, without the most abundant and substantial reasons.

W. E. H. Lecky, M.A., in his history of the rise and influence of Rationalism in Europe, in the chapter on Persecution, thus notices the notorious cruelty of the Papacy:—"That the Church of Rome has shed *more* innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind, will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history. The memorials, indeed, of many of her persecutions are now so scanty that it is impossible to form a complete conception of the *multitude of her victims*, and it is quite certain that no powers of imagination can adequately realise their sufferings." (Page 35, Vol. II.) "It can surely be no exaggeration to say that the Church of Rome has inflicted a *greater amount* of unmerited suffering than *any other* religion that has ever existed among mankind." (Page 42, Vol. II.)

Not content with ordinary means of persecution, and an occa-

sional supply of victims, as they might intrude themselves on her notice, the insatiable blood-thirstiness of the Romish Harlot must be gratified in a more regular, and wholesale, manner; for she would be drunken with the blood of the saints: wherefore, an elaborate system of murder and torture was invented, on purpose to satisfy this hellish greed. In the days of Pope Innocent III. was first established that infernal tribunal, the Inquisition; into whose horrible and fiendish grip, all enemies, real or imaginary, of the Church of Rome were barbarously delivered. Within the dark and gloomy dungeons of the Inquisitorial Palaces throughout Europe, scenes were enacted, and tortures inflicted, which positively defy description. No refinement of agony that the blood-besotted minds of a cruel priesthood could suggest, was omitted from their category of punishments, and whole hecatombs of helpless and pining victims were by such instrumentalities made to pass through flames of indescribable suffering into the eternal world. No wonder that the souls of those slain by this Church, cry from under the altar, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our blood?" No wonder that upon this wicked Church is charged "the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all slain upon the earth" (Rev. xviii., 24), for she seems to have possessed a reversionary inheritance in all the hellish malice, exhibited through human nature, against the people of God, from the foundation of the world.

Paganism was, and is still, cruel; Mahometanism was cruel; Brahminism, and Buddhism, are cruel; but these systems were never hopelessly persecuting. Papal Rome, on the contrary, did that which is without parallel: She invented torture—She laid snares and traps secretly for victims—She hid her barbarities behind impenetrable walls—She sported with the blood and lives of her victims, and gloated over their agonies. Need we marvel at the strong rejoicing over her downfall?—that torment and sorrow are to be her lot?—that she is to be utterly burned with fire, and thrown down with violence, and her smoke ascend up for ever and ever? Nothing short of such a doom could wipe out the blood stains of the Church of Rome! and well for man that

her Judge is none other than the Lord God, whose arm is strong and irresistible.

It will be well, perhaps, in this place, just to enumerate some of the awful and relentless modes of torture, which the Church of Rome has invented and employed, from time to time, against the saints of God; in order to coerce them, by brute force, into subjection to her authority. I shall be as brief as possible in the enumeration, not having space to particularise the occasion when each cruelty was practised; but, for more complete information on this most disagreeable topic, I can refer the reader to a large volume—Foxe's Book of Martyrs—which is almost entirely devoted to the story of Papal Rome's persecutions; and, after the perusal of this work, I can hardly believe any man, in his sober senses, ever again sanctioning, or indirectly seconding, any parley with the Church of Rome. In the hands of the Inquisitors, the victims were either killed outright, or, what is worse, tortured to death by slow degrees.

Death was brought quickly to her prisoners of despair, by means of—

- Drowning in the ordinary way.
- Decapitation, by axe or guillotine.
- Shooting, in military fashion.
- Broiling over a slow fire.
- Hanging to a gibbet.
- Burning at the stake.
- Suffocation, in various ways.
- Blowing off the head with gunpowder.
- Burning, after covering the body with pitch.
- A Machine with knives, which cut the flesh in little pieces from the bones.
- Military and indiscriminate slaughter, with swords and spears.

Thus did Rome make short work of those heroes of a true Christianity—hoping to stifle their grand confession of faith, by the aid of the executioner; and, in her passionate mood, altogether forgetting that the “blood of the martyrs is the very seed of the Church.”

Torture was inflicted on the helpless captives of her will, by—

- Cutting out the tongue.
- Pouring boiling lead on the feet.

Twisting cord round the forehead until the eyes gushed out.
 Cutting off noses, ears, and hands.
 Crushing the thumbs, in an instrument called the "Thumb Screw."
 Distorting the human frame, in an iron instrument called
 the "Scavenger's Daughter."
 Placing on the neck an iron collar with spikes.
 Racking of the limbs, until all the joints were dislocated.
 Flogging, with whips and scourges.
 Branding the body with hot irons.
 Tearing out pieces of flesh with red-hot pincers.
 Fixing the head of the victim in a box, and dropping water
 every second upon the temples, until all circulation
 was stopped.
 Imprisonment in the most horrible of dungeons.
 Starvation.

And in this way, poor mortals were forced frequently to blaspheme, in the hour of suffering, that religion for which they were willing to die, the very moment the hand of cruelty was withdrawn.

That remarkable expedition, the Spanish Armada, which was so providentially wrecked on our coasts in the days of Queen Elizabeth, brought over with it, many memorials of the audacious villany of this Harlot Church. On board several of the vessels of the Spanish fleet, were the instruments of torture, which would most undoubtedly have been employed for the so-called conversion of England, had that Hispano-Papal enterprise been successful. A visit to the Tower of London will convince any one, however sceptical, of the grim reality of Papal Rome's intolerable persecutions. There, on the walls of that fortress, are exhibited the tools or instruments of cruelty, forged and prepared by Papists, to be used by Papists, in their wicked endeavours to overthrow and subvert England's Protestant Queen, and her Protestant religion.

Britain's sons and daughters have been slain by this intrusive and persecuting Harlot; slain because they refused their allegiance to a strange and perverse religion; and the foreign Prince who sought to impose it, and no doubt a goodly number of British Martyrs await, in the mansions of Heaven, the intelligence of their persecutors' judgment and desolation. But it was on the Continent of Europe that the Mystical Babylon

exhibited her greatest greed for blood—and created the most wide-spread desolations. In France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Bohemia, Piedmont, Germany, The Netherlands, Poland, and other countries, the bloody footprints of the Scarlet Lady have been distinctly and widely traced; and could statistics be forthcoming, I have little doubt but that from first to last, many millions of souls have perished, victims to the priestly malice of the Popish Hierarchy. What a story of suffering could France lay to the charge of this Church. From the first considerable persecution of the Waldenses, in the twelfth century, to the suppression of the edict of Nantes in the seventeenth century, perpetual cruelties were practised on her Protestant peoples. The Waldensian persecution, commenced in the twelfth century, extended at intervals over at least four centuries. The Albigenses, another class of Protestants, endured, for a shorter period, great severities at the hands of Rome. “The visible assemblies of the Paulicians or Albigeois were extirpated by fire and sword; and the bleeding remnant escaped by flight, concealment, or Catholic conformity.” (Gibbon, xiv. chap.) In the year 1572, that series of horrible massacres of Protestant Huguenots took place, all conceived, or instigated, by the Papacy. “Ten thousand men and women, old and young, of all sorts and conditions;” were said to have been slain, in three days, in the capital only, and throughout France, during these tumults, 30,000 in all were “in divers ways destroyed.” These massacres in France were commemorated by a Papal Medal, depicting the angel of death at his bloody work; thus the Harlot as though unabashed at the shedding of so much blood, even glorified herself on the hellish achievement.

What Spain could witness against the Mystical Woman, may perhaps never be fully known; since, to this very day, that nation is tied hand and foot, and seems totally unable to shake off the wicked influence of her spiritual dominator. Rome’s treatment of the Jews alone in the Peninsula, is sufficient to fix on her an indelible stigma. So violent and malicious was her hatred of the “chosen people,” that no son of Abraham can, even in this *enlightened* century, openly reside there. The

Inquisition in Spain has very effectually done its work—has really silenced all opposition, stifled all biblical investigation, and slain an untold number of victims. Elliot, quoting from M'Crie's "Reformation in Spain," informs us that the very first year after the re-establishment of the Inquisition in that country in 1478, two thousand victims were burnt, and up to the date of the outbreak of the Reformation, in 1517,—

13,000 persons were burnt by Rome for heresy.

8,700 „ „ burnt in effigy.

169,000 „ „ condemned to penance.

In 1641, Erin's fair island flowed with blood at the bidding, and by the agents of Papal Rome. "No age, no sex, no condition was spared." The Romanists, at the instigation of Priests and Friars, were in arms, and the most relentlessly persecuting effort was made, to exterminate all Protestants, and drive them from the kingdom. The Roman Catholic Cardinal Richelieu, aided the rebellion with money from his own treasury. *Many, many* thousands of Protestants were barbarously slain in the sister isle, by the emissaries of a Church, which our Modern Liberal Governments have especially strengthened and fondled, and which I fear the present Government is preparing still further to conciliate.

This persecuting Church of Rome has even followed the departed with her relentless hate, and instances of dead men's bodies being exhumed and burnt, form part of the records of her crimes, as if on purpose to distinguish this system as the most blood-thirsty of all that ever opposed the truth of God.

Section Sixth.

THE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE—A SENSUAL CHURCH.

THE PROPHECY.

“And the WOMAN was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with *gold* and *precious stones* and *pearls*.”—Rev. xvii., 4.

“And the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the *abundance of her delicacies*.”—Rev. xviii., 3.

“That GREAT CITY, that was clothed in fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and decked with *gold*, and *precious stones*, and *pearls*.”—Rev. xviii., 16.

“And the merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her; for no man buyeth their merchandise any more: the merchandise of *gold*, and *silver*, and *precious stones*, and of *pearls*, and *purple*, and *fine linen*, and *silk*, and *scarlet*, and all thyme wood, and all manner of vessels of ivory, and all manner of vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and bodies and souls of men. And the fruits that thy soul lusted after are departed from thee, and all things which were dainty and goodly have departed from thee.”—Rev. xviii., 11—14.

THE FULFILMENT.

I NEED write but little to prove that the Church of Rome is a sensual Church; for most of my readers must be well acquainted with the glittering and sensuous paraphernalia, which the Papacy considers essential to the successful carrying out of her perverted system of theology. In these days of inquiry and travel, there are but few who have not witnessed the gorgeous ceremonial, by which that Church pretends to honour the God and Saviour of the world. Her religious services might, in simple truth, be termed an ovation to man's sensuous being.

Beautiful and costly vestments, flowers and illuminations, to rivet and gratify the organs of vision. Delicious perfumes of myrrh and olibanum to regale another sense. Music of the most enrapturing kind to enthrall a third. Such is the customary entertainment provided by a Church whose object, alas!—if the Bible be true—is to destroy, and not to save the precious and immortal souls of our fallen race.

The splendour and riches of this false Church of St. John's Revelation, even if they stood alone in evidence, would compel me to fix on Papal Rome as the identical system foretold; for what Church can compare with the Roman in these respects? Certainly not the German Lutheran—and still less the Anglican Episcopacy—wherefore, there only remains the Greek or Eastern Church, and even if the fact of her being a branch, or offshoot, of the Papacy, did not preclude her from claiming a distinct and separate existence, still she would not compare with the magnificence of her now western rival at Rome.

The apparel of the Harlot is expressly particularised; and purple, and scarlet, are the predominating colours. So the Church of Rome has chosen purple and scarlet, the emblems of Royalty, for the most prominent portions of her attire. Pearls and gems, or precious stones, are likewise included in the costly decorations of this spiritual Harlot, standing, or sitting on the world's highway, to attract and snare the unwary passers. Writing of this particular portraiture of the Woman, Elliott in his "Horæ" (Vol. iv. 30) describes it "as a picture characteristic, and from the life, the dress specified being distinctively that of the Romish Ecclesiastical dignitaries, (for these colours appertain to the dress of the ecclesiastical dignitaries of no other Church, I believe; neither the Greek, Armenian, or Coptic, of course not that of the English), and the ornaments, those with which it has been bedecked beyond any Church called Christian; nay, beyond any religious body and religion probably that has ever existed in the world."

Archdeacon Wordsworth in his "Union with Rome," refers to a book entitled "Cereemoniale Romanum," compiled nearly four centuries since by a dignitary of the Romish Church, and quoting

from a description therein given of the Pope's installation, says : " We there read the following order of proceeding : ' The Pontiff Elect is conducted to the Sacrarium, and divested of his ordinary attire, and is clad in the Papal Robes.' The colour of these is then minutely described. Suffice it to say that five different articles of dress in which he is arrayed are *scarlet*. Another vest is specified, and this is covered with *pearls*. His mitre is then mentioned ; and this is adorned with *gold* and *precious stones*." In the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, (as figured in Elliott, Vol. iii., 165), is an original Papal indulgence, with a coloured figure of the so-called " Beatissimi Pater " in the centre, and both *purple* and *scarlet* colour are there forming portions of the Pope's dress. At page 168, Elliott gives another coloured illustration, being an exact copy of an engraving published at Rome, with the license of the authorities, representing the Pope receiving adoration on the high altar of St. Peter's, and the *gold* and the *scarlet* are again conspicuous in the Pope's apparel.

The Pope's present crown or mitre, presented by Napoleon I., is described as having a foundation of white velvet, the three crowns being composed of sapphires, emeralds, rubies, and *pearls*; and on its summit one large emerald surmounted by a cross of diamonds, its value being £18,000. (" Armageddon," Vol. I., 140).

Scarlet colour predominates also in the dress of the Cardinals, as is well known. Their hats are *scarlet*—their robes are *scarlet*—as well as, I believe, other portions of their attire : and, indeed, so frequently does *scarlet* colour obtrude itself in the vestments of the Romish hierarchy, that quite commonly the Papacy is now denominated in the secular writings of the day " The *Scarlet Lady*." *Fine linen* also enters largely into the costumes of those officiating in the services of the Church of Rome, thus completely does she embrace, in her ecclesiastical vestments, all the materials specified in the Apocalypse. A curious coincidence, recorded in history, affords a very fair criterion of the *costliness* of some of the decorations affixed to the Romish garments ; as, for instance, when in 1798 the French took Rome, the sacerdotal robes of the Popes and Cardinals, were actually consigned to the

flames, in order to collect from the ashes the gold with which they had been adorned.

The historian, Gibbon, describing the artifices resorted to by the Church of Rome to charm the senses of the vulgar, gives us some idea of her earliest attempts to profane the simplicity of Christian worship: "As soon as the doors of the church were thrown open, they must have been offended with the smoke of incense, the perfume of flowers, and the glare of lamps and tapers, which diffused at noon-day a gaudy, superfluous, and sacrilegious light. If they approached the balustrade of the altar, they made their way through the prostrate crowd, consisting for the most part of strangers and pilgrims, who resorted to the city on the vigil of the feast, and who already felt the strong intoxication of fanaticism, and perhaps of wine. Their devout kisses were imprinted on the walls and pavement of the sacred edifice; and their fervent prayers were directed, whatever might be the language of their Church, to the bones, the blood, or the ashes, of the saints which were usually concealed by a linen or silken veil from the eyes of the vulgar. The walls were hung round with symbols of the favours which they had received, eyes, and hands and feet of gold and silver, and edifying pictures, which could not long escape the abuse of indiscreet or idolatrous devotion, represented the image, the attributes, and the miracles of the tutelar saint." (Gibbon, chap. xxix.)

This last sentence from Gibbon, suggests at once, another form of Papal sensuality; I allude to the excessive and costly decoration of her churches, and buildings; where every precious metal, or marble, can be found—as it is found nowhere else in the world—in the greatest abundance. The wealth of the Church of Rome has been almost fabulous, which fact we learn from the valuation of the ecclesiastical properties in France, Italy, and Spain, where they have been confiscated and devoted to the temporal wants of the state. Romish Priests have always been keenly sensitive to the value of property; and have coveted the bodies as well as the souls of men; their estates as well as their obedience. How many young and wealthy victims has this Church made? taking possession of all that belonged to them, proving *her* kingdom to be far more of this world, than of that

which is to come. Have not the Romish Priests and Monks also been celebrated for their good cheer? making the merchandise of *wine* and *oil*, *fine flour* and *wheat*, *beasts* and *sheep*, most appropriate in the category of things that their souls lusted after. And when the extent of the Romish Communion is considered; when it is recollected that hundreds of millions have bowed down to her authority; that her Churches are spread far and wide over the globe; her Priests and Friars, her Nuns and Novices to be counted by hundreds of thousands; everywhere throughout the wide extent of her sway the same extravagance of dress, decorations, and indulgences, being practised, the fact that Merchants of the earth weep ever her downfall admits of easy explanation; for the trade connected with Papal Rome's sensual services must be so considerable, that a cessation of it would be seriously felt in the commercial world. If God permit, and another edition of this work should be called for, I shall hope by that time to have collected certain statistics, which will enable me to show how enormous a trade depends upon the existence of this abominable heresy.

In drawing the analogy between Papal Rome, and Pagan Babylon, in "Section Second," I omitted one very striking resemblance pertaining to the riches of these two systems, from Rawlinson's "Ancient Monarchies;" and as it is particularly appropriate, I will give the quotation in this place. "The Assyrian Kings were accustomed to deposit in the temples of their gods, as thank offerings, many precious products from the countries which they overran in their expeditions. *Stones*, and *Marbles* of various kinds, rare *metals*, and images of foreign deities are particularly mentioned." (Vol. ii. 274). On the Continent, similar offerings adorn the walls of Roman Catholic churches and chapels.

Probably quite sufficient has been advanced to prove the exceeding sensuality of the Church of Rome—but as furnish other and indirect testimony to the same truth, I would just mention that great controversy now raging in the Anglican Church, concerning vestments, incense and other sensualities; all of which, say the people, come from Rome—thus do they bear witness to the truth of God's written revelation—which denominates that Church the spiritual mother of abomination.

Section Seventy.

THE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE—A CONFIDENT CHURCH.

THE PROPHECY.

“For she saith in her heart, I sit a QUEEN, and am no WIDOW, and shall see no sorrow.”—Rev. xviii., 7.

THE FULFILMENT.

THE particular characteristic mentioned in this Prophecy, (confidence) is one which would most naturally belong to a false or harlot Church, as distinguished from the true and faithful assembly of the saints—the Bride of Christ—whose demeanour would be one of diffidence. Again the Papacy fulfils the prediction of God’s Word, in a manner not to be mistaken; and so confident is the Church of Rome in the extent and durability of her influence, and existence, that she affects to despise all her enemies, however numerous or subtle they may be, and sits complacently at Rome, even with the waves of the revolution surging up to the very gates and doors of the Vatican. Unmoved by threats of foes, undisturbed by warnings of friends, the Pope refuses to believe that any mischief can befall the venerable institution he represents and defends. The counsels of his kingly satellites, as well as the entreaties of his best-beloved subjects, he ever meets with the, now proverbial cry, “Non possumus;” and still fondly imagines that he will yet see the infidel power, that lays such close siege to his citadel, annihilated and destroyed; or driven back again to hide itself in the oblivion of forgetfulness and shame.

Truly has the Papacy again and again declared, by the lips of her Popes or Cardinals, "I sit a queen, and shall see no sorrow." Blinded by a pride which has accumulated through ages of prosperity, and exercising a moral fascination over the hearts of nations for so many centuries, she cannot bring herself to realise the sad fact, that love is suddenly turned to hatred—the spell which bound the nations to her hideous dogmas, and practices, broken—and she left helpless, and weak, to be despoiled and desolated. All this, the false Church is unprepared to believe, and still she boasts, "I sit a Queen, and am no widow;" and this self-confidence seems to have increased just in the same proportion as her impotence grew more apparent, until it has become possible for the entire system to be swept ruthlessly away, at the very moment when it shall most pride itself on its permanence and security.

This confidence of the false Church, as the text itself evinces, is a feature of sufficient moment to be particularly specified by the communicating Angel; and I feel sure that every reader, having a moderate acquaintance with history, will easily recognise this self-importance of the Church of Rome, as not one of the least striking evidences which identify her with the Great Babylon of the Apocalypse. The pages of history must contain *innumerable* instances of this self-confidence of the Church of Rome. Plain speeches, or pastorals, emphatically declaring her indefectibility, startlingly, and even verbally, like the predictions of the Revelation, have been frequently uttered from the Vatican. I have not the time, on this occasion, to search out the past records of this prominent trait in the character of the Mystical Harlot; but can give a few of the more immediate and recent manifestations of her confident spirit, by way of positive illustration; and they are, perhaps, the more remarkable, and noteworthy, from being uttered at the moment of a sunset which will leave Rome Papal in the darkness of a doom never to be reversed.

When the French troops were withdrawn from Rome last year (1866), the Pope, on taking leave of the French officers, the men whose very swords had been upholding his decayed, and decaying, authority, he professed great confidence in the future:

“You come to take farewell of me. I shall not inquire whether the moment of your departure is very opportune. You belong to an army which possesses the traditions of honour, of duty, and every military virtue. You are executing the orders of your chief. Your duty is to obey—mine is to thank you for the zealous and devoted support you have given me. You are leaving me in face of an audacious, unjust, and impious revolution, *before which I shall not bend my head.* I am tranquil as to my destiny and that of the holy see, because I have entire confidence in the protection of Him who said to the sea, ‘*Thou shalt go no further.*’”—*Daily Telegraph*, December 11, 1866.

And since the temporary return of the French, and the check given to the more impetuous pursuers of Liberalism and infidelity, by the battle of Mentana, the authorities of the Roman Church seem to imagine that the decrees of fate are about to restore to the dominion of the Pope, all those territories and possessions of which he has been recently despoiled.

On two occasions, Cardinal Cullen has given forcible expression to these sanguine expectations:—

“I need scarcely add, that though we may be in alarm for the personal safety or welfare of the Pope, we can never fear *for the duration of his spiritual authority*, though it may be assailed by all the powers of earth and hell. *Peter will always continue, in the person of the Pontiffs*, to feed the sheep and lambs of Christ; he will always retain the keys of the kingdom of heaven; he will always exercise the right of binding and loosing; and even to the *consummation of ages* he will be the solid foundation of the Church, the rock upon *which it was built.*”—*Standard*, October 31, 1867.

The *Daily Telegraph* of 15th November last, reports likewise a speech of the same Cardinal, in which he took occasion especially to notice the general expectation of Papal decline, in a most confident tone:—

“His Eminence referred *contemptuously to the fanatical prophecies announcing the approaching downfall of the Papacy*, and appealed to Lord Macaulay’s New Zealander to bear witness *against these delusions of the human mind.* He urged that it was the duty of

the Irish people to join those of other countries in raising their voices in favour of the Pope. History showed distinctly how necessary it was for the Pope to be independent of every temporal prince, in order to provide for the free exercise of his spiritual authority. His Eminence concluded his address by expressing a hope that Roman Catholics, and well-wishers of their cause, would never rest satisfied until all their ancient states had been restored to the Pope."

But all this boast and vaunt, however it may deceive the priest-ridden members of her communion, in no way contributes to the maintenance, or restoration, of the Church of Rome. It is but another sign of her blind infatuation; a sure proof of her decline; and if God's Holy Book speaks to man with a certain sound, no confidence of the Pope and Cardinals; no brazen defiance of the powers of evil, will avail to stem that torrent of wrath, about to fall on the temporal glory of Papal Rome with such a crash, as to bury in its ruins all her spiritual influence likewise. It is because she saith in her heart, "I sit a Queen, and shall see no sorrow," that "her plagues shall come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine." (Rev. xviii.)

Dr. Wordsworth has very eloquently noticed this feature of Papal confidence. He says: "Some at the present critical time, may be in danger of being deluded by the *confident* language and bearing of Rome. They may imagine, that a cause pursued with such sanguine reliance, and with such outward appearance of success, must be good. But let us remember the parallel—Babylon. Its streets echoed with music; its halls resounded with mirth and revelry; its king's guards were intoxicated at the gates of the city and at the very doors of the palaces, and the vessels of gold were on the tables at the royal banquet; when the fingers of a man's hand came forth from the wall, and Babylon fell. So Rome will be most infatuated, when most in peril. She will exult with joy, and be flushed with hope, and be elated with triumph, when the judgments of God are ready to fall upon her. Her Princes and her Prelates will vaunt her power, and will as at this hour be making new aggressions, and be putting forth new doctrines, and be entranced in a dream of

security when her doom is nigh. And as the great River, the river Euphrates, the glory and bulwark of Babylon, became a road for Cyrus and his victorious army when he besieged and took the city, so the swelling stream of Rome's supremacy, which has now flowed on so proudly for so many centuries, and has served for her aggrandisement, will be in God's hands the means and occasion of her destruction." ("Union with Rome," p. 117).

I have suggested that the fall of the temporal power will, in all probability, end the spiritual reign, likewise, of the Church of Rome, and I am impressed with this belief for several cogent reasons, the most important being, the very small admixture of spirituality to be found in that false system, which is almost wholly earthly and sensual. To retain any spiritual influence after the loss of her temporalities—inclusive of the power to deceive and to compel—would necessitate such vital reforms in her theological teaching, such a return to primitive truth and simplicity, as, I may safely affirm, Papal Rome will never submit to. Indeed, with such a radical change, she would cease to be the Church *of* Rome. So that Dr. Manning, and other celebrities of the Romish Communion, may be as *confident* as they please, about the duration of their Church, yet the end has surely come; and, to crown this supposition, we have the Bible assurance, that "with violence shall that great City be thrown down, and be found *no more* AT ALL." (Rev. xviii., 21).

Section Eighth.

DOOM OF THE FALSE CHURCH SEEN BY THE APOSTLE.

THE PROPHECY.

“And the cities of the nations fell: and GREAT BABYLON came into remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.”—Rev. xvi., 19.

“Come hither; I will shew thee the judgment of the GREAT WHORE.”—Rev. xvii., 1.

“And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the WHORE, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.”—Rev. xvii., 16.

“For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.”—Rev. xviii., 5—8.

“And there followed another angel, saying, BABYLON is fallen, is fallen, that GREAT CITY.”—Rev. xiv., 8.

“And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, BABYLON THE GREAT is fallen, is fallen.”—Rev. xviii., 2.

“And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that GREAT CITY BABYLON be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all.”—Rev. xviii., 21.

“For he hath judged the GREAT WHORE, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand.”—Rev. xix., 2.

“And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see the smoke of her burning, standing afar off for fear of her torment, saying, Alas! Alas! that GREAT CITY BABYLON, that MIGHTY CITY! for in one hour is thy judgment come.”—Rev. xviii., 9, 10.

THE FULFILMENT.

THE foregoing passages of Holy Scripture depict in figurative and emblematical language, the doom of that system or power

distinguished in God's word as Babylon the Great; and they exhibit to the mind of the attentive reader, first—a Church (the Woman) leaning or depending upon an Emperor, or Empire (the Beast), for support and protection; secondly—ten kings or kingdoms (ten horns), collectively forming one confederacy, having spiritual relations (committing fornication) with this Church, but suddenly transferring their allegiance, *voluntarily* to the Emperor, or Empire, (the Beast) on which the Church (the Woman) is seen to depend (sit); and under this new *secular* leadership hating and deserting the Church, stripping her of her glory, absorbing her territory (eating her flesh), and wasting her influence by war (burn her with fire). Such is obviously the plain teaching of the vision; and there is evidently involved in this tremendous change of conduct, all the elements of a mighty and fierce revolution; since the visitation falls upon the Harlot Church with suddenness (in one hour), and with great violence. (Thus with violence.)

In this awful doom of the Mystical Babylon we are invited, as it were, to recognize alike the aroused indignation of men, upon whom the wicked Church had so long practised her shameful impositions; and the righteous vengeance of God on behalf of his suffering saints. He thus again, as on so many past occasions, making the wrath of man to praise Him.

Previous to the final desolation of this Harlot Church, the cities or governmental centres of the ten kingdoms or nations with whom she had been in intimate alliance, are represented (Rev. xvi. 19) as falling (the cities of the nations fell); dropping off from their fealty, and vows, to the Romish whore. And inasmuch as the kings of these ten kingdoms, (or *some* of them at least) are described in another part of the Revelation (xviii. 9, 10) as mourning over, lamenting, and bewailing the torment of Babylon; I think it may very fairly be surmised, that the same revolution which ultimately crushes the false Church, had previously driven away those kings, with whom the woman had committed spiritual fornication. That the kings had been divorced from their kingdoms is evident, else, why mourn over that which otherwise their own intervention must have brought

about? and why stand *afar off* if they still possessed any power to remedy the catastrophe?

The ten kingdoms *voluntarily* join the secular and blaspheming Empire, in its crusade against the woman; and in turning their backs on the false Church, what more likely, or natural, than that they should expel from their thrones those sovereigns who might still cling to the old theocratic alliance? This supposition, indeed, harmonises remarkably well with the other scriptural signs of the last days. Kings were to be deposed, (put out of the way) and governments overthrown, expressly that the mystery of lawlessness might work successfully, and without let or hindrance, in its opposition to religion, whether true or false (1 Thess. ii.) It would likewise appear that the passage in verse eleven of the above-named chapter, which represents God as sending upon the lawless men of the last days strong delusion that they should believe a lie—is parallel to that verse connected with the hating of the Woman by the lawless Empire in Revelation xvii., 17: "For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil His will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the Beast."

Seduced by the plausible deceptions of the dark and dismal characteristics of the mystery of lawlessness, the ten kingdoms *voluntarily* join themselves together in one defiant confederation, consent to be led by their representative hero, the lawless one, and under his supreme guidance, oppose and exalt themselves against all religion, and worship, whether true or false, *inclusive* of the Scarlet Lady at Rome, that source and centre of so many abominations. God, in this way, using the wrath of man, and his lawless phrenzies, first to punish the *great whore* drunken with the blood of the Saints—and afterwards in allowing these apostate nations to fill up their cup of impiety and blasphemy to the full, previous to an awful and inevitable doom; that they *all* might be damned, who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness; for it should be especially noticed that it is not so much because Babylon the Great is corrupt, that the lawless men defy and destroy her, but because they seek to obliterate all trace of the Divine Government from the earth, and "say unto God, Depart from us."

Another very striking coincidence we have recorded in the fact that the reign of the democratic Empire (the Beast)—that confederation of states under the sovereignty of the eighth head—endures just the same time as is occupied in the doom and destruction of Babylon; for whose misfortune, indeed, they seem particularly to league themselves. A new set of rulers, governing their respective states in consonance with the lawless principles of Antichrist, receive power as kings *one hour* with the Beast (Revelations xvii.); and if the reader will turn to the xxiii. chapter, where the fall of Babylon is depicted, he will find it said that “in *one hour* is thy judgment come.”

In considering the doom of the false Church, as revealed in the Bible, I find very substantial proof that this ecclesiastical system, known as “Babylon the Great,” is *not* the “mystery of iniquity” (lawlessness), as so many writers persistently affirm. Neither is the head of that Church, the Man of sin, or the wicked (lawless) one of St. Paul; and this assertion the most simple-minded can easily ascertain to be true. Chapter xix. of Revelation commences with rejoicings over the *fall* of Babylon the Great, whose smoke is represented as rising up for ever and ever; and then follow on, in rapid succession, the opening of heaven and the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ—the Word of God—to judge and govern the world; simultaneously with the opposition of the Beast, and the kings of the earth and their armies, who meet with destruction from the sword of Him that sitteth upon the horse, which sword proceedeth out of His mouth; and referring to 2 Thessalonians ii., I find St. Paul’s lawless one is also destroyed in a similar manner, at the appearing of Christ, “with the spirit of His mouth.”

Again, in the xiv. chapter, at verse eight, there is described the destruction of Babylon the Great; and *afterwards* comes the warning about the Beast with his image, and mark; proving that the two-horned Beast of chapter xiii. has nothing to do with Babylon the Great, other than being the Beast on which she first rides, but who afterwards conspires for her final overthrow. This two-horned Beast is further identified as the eighth head of the Roman Empire—the Man of sin—the Lawless one—whom Christ

shall personally confound ; for it is the two-horned Beast that employs the secret service of a mark, or sign ; and this is the Beast that wages the final and impious war against Christ revealed from heaven (see chap. xix., 19, 20).

Turning from the book of Prophecy, written nearly two thousand years ago, to the page of contemporaneous history now lying open before us in all the brilliancy of reality, I find an exact and literal fulfilment of each and every particular prediction just considered. Without much hesitation, I think I may now affirm, that the false Church of the Revelation of St. John is the Papacy, seated on the seven hills of Rome, and committing fornication with the kings of the earth ; and these being in very deed her last moments—as all writers, both secular and ecclesiastical, readily admit,—we thereby discover, beyond controversy, that the scarlet Beast on which the Woman has been riding, is none other than the Imperial democratic Empire of France, under the domination of Louis Napoleon ; whose soldiers have for many years propped up, and caused to be respected, the fast perishing power of the Papacy. This fact further proves Louis Napoleon to be the eighth, or resurrection seventh head, of the Apocalyptic Wild Beast ; for St. John particularly notices that the Beast which carries the Woman in her last moments, is the eighth—“the Beast that *was*, and *is not*, and yet *is*.”

Not ten years since, and the Papacy was apparently prosperous, well protected by the Empire of France, and having special relations, or concordats, with the kings of the divided Roman Empire ; and, to say the least, it is singular that there were exactly *ten* Latin or Roman kingdoms, speaking the Latin or Roman language, who then bore allegiance to the Roman or Latin Harlot Church, seated at the city of the seven hills :—

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. France. | 6. Naples. |
| 2. Piedmont. | 7. Modena. |
| 3. Austrian Italy. | 8. Parma. |
| 4. Spain. | 9. Tuscany. |
| 5. Portugal. | 10. States of the Church. |

Other kingdoms, certainly, had relations with Rome, but they

were not Roman or Latin; and it must not be forgotten that it is the Roman or Latin Empire which is the subject of St. John's and Daniel's prophecies concerning the last great kingdom that was to exist in the world, previous to Christ's kingdom of the Stone.

Such was the condition of the Papacy not ten years ago, and yet, what marvellous changes have since occurred! and how has the mighty one fallen! Revolutionary Europe has really combined to overthrow the Papacy, and not only the Papacy, but religion itself, as a ruling or influencing power in the State. In all the great Catholic countries a democratic and secret hierarchy of wicked spirits have been quietly perverting the minds of the people, gradually supplanting the wholesome and truthful principles of Christianity, and substituting those impious and intolerable ideas embraced under the term, "*Secularization of Politics.*"

Then, there is the Emperor of France—the resurrection Napoleon—the offspring of the Revolution—the incarnation of Democracy—the Messiah of Liberalism—the embodiment of universal suffrage,—what could such a Potentate have to do with the Papacy, except to hate and destroy it? What *real* friendship could exist between the expression of popular-right-infidelity, and the representative of divine-right-theology? except such as the most temporizing policy might dictate, or the most worthless motives inspire? Such must have been the silent conviction of many a thinking mind; and such, doubtless, were the views privately, or half suspiciously, entertained by the Pope and the Roman Cardinals. Yet how could they act? How unmask the suspected traitor? How could they anathematise the Emperor as their enemy, whilst he was consorting so earnestly, to all appearance, with this Harlot system? As already stated, he espoused her cause in every conflict, proclaiming himself, loudly, the protector of the Latin Nations, and of the Latin Church; actively warring in her interests, surrounding the throne of St. Peter with an army of French bayonets and cannon. How could the Church of Rome doubt such friendly intervention? How dream that betrayal lurked beneath the smiles of love? The Church of Rome, with all her serpent-wisdom, the Pope, with all his much-dreaded

infallibility, was not equal to the occasion; and, as we shall see, until too late, dared not raise one whisper against the assassin who was quietly and affectionately undermining the very foundations of his power. Some few, nevertheless, did suspect, openly intimating their fears of treachery; and the Emperor Napoleon has been compared to Judas Iscariot, and Pontius Pilate, by high dignitaries of the Papacy: To Judas, because he was assumed to be destroying the Church with a kiss; to Pontius Pilate, because, in spite of lingering misgivings and pricks of conscience, he, with apparent reluctance, surrendered the Church to the power of the revolution. Whilst even the Pope himself has ventured so far, as publicly to denounce that spirit of Liberalism, of which the Emperor considers himself the embodiment, and is the acknowledged champion.

The power of the revolution, as directed against the Church of Rome, could not, of necessity, make any substantial progress, whilst Austria remained strong and unbroken. The Emperor of Austria was a firm and vigorous ally of the Papacy, as also the King of Naples, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the Duke of Modena, and the Duchess of Parma; therefore the first blow of the revolution, subsequent to its re-establishment in France, was levelled against the power of the Hapsburgs. The Emperor of France, "as the head and leader of all nations who are seeking for their freedom," marched his forces into Italy, and so effectually crippled Austrian influence in that country, that the Papal party of kings in the Peninsula, fell down and disappeared, like a house built of cards; the Papal dominions suffered a serious curtailment, and she was violently despoiled of her possessions. "The cities of the nations" literally fell in that war! Solferino, Milan, Naples, Messina, Palermo, Gaeta, Florence, Modena, Parma, Ancona,—all centres and strongholds of Roman or Latin Catholicism. In all of these capitals of states, or provinces, the power of the Papacy lapsed, as though by magic. The revolution "came, and saw, and conquered." The governments, kings, and princes, fled into exile—and Liberalism, or Lawlessness, triumphed completely. Then, indeed, Great Babylon (Rome) herself came into remembrance, and the eyes of the Italians were

turned resolutely towards the great city, the city of the seven hills. They demanded it of the Pope as the natural capital of their country. They denounced the Papacy in words of vehement hatred; and, but for the prolonged diplomacy of France, would have, ere this, rushed eagerly upon Rome and despoiled it, casting the false Church with violence to the ground.

Not sufficiently ripe, however, were the schemes of the Emperor, to permit this rapid extinction; for in 1861, he again professed attachment to the religion, and person, of the Holy Father; and by increasing his army at the city of Rome, stayed for a brief while longer, the envenomed fury of the revolution. With what real sincerity, posterity will best judge when able to review the tragedy in its completeness, since only five years had passed away, when he, the chief of democracy, made an arrangement with Italy, by which Rome would be gradually evacuated, and the Pope, and his mummeries, left to the tender mercies of his own subjects, or the intrigues of his enemies beyond.

In the late German war, another move was made by the revolution, towards the attainment of its object. Austria, still holding a part of Italy, exercised a certain pro-Papal influence; and therefore the revolutionary party again set to work—this time with the tacit connivance, although not with the active intervention, of France. It was, nevertheless, the revolution at work; for Prussia seems on purpose to have suddenly given up her "divine right" theory, and embraced "universal suffrage" as the basis of her future. She joined hands with Italy, to wrest from Austria the remaining portion of that kingdom still under subjugation, as well as the proud pre-eminence of the Hapsburgs in Germany. Empire democracy, again successful, Austria retired, Venice gravitated to the new kingdom, and again (in Germany) there was a mysterious disappearance of sovereigns, and a diminishing of the power of those that remained. The Pope seeing all this, and in view of the imminent departure of the last remaining French troops from Rome, was evidently expecting the end; and not without good and sufficient reason, since he must have known that the Italian people, including his own loyal Romans, would, if left alone, discard the Papal influence for ever, occupy her throne,

and reduce the proud Harlot to a position of ignominious and intolerable servitude. Garibaldi, and his red-shirted soldiers, have been within sight of the walls of Rome. An armed insurrection has arisen within the very gates; and, but for the re-appearance on the scene of French troops, still further to prolong her agonies of dissolution, the proud Papal Woman would have been discarded, the prophecy concerning Babylon the Great fulfilled, and that great city violently thrown down. Nor can that mighty event, foretold so distinctly by God, be much longer delayed. The Italians are alienated from the Papacy for ever. The French Emperor must fulfil his mission as the "incarnation of the revolution," or surrender his throne to the dynasty he displaced. The future is clear: the Roman Catholic Church is doomed.

This hating of the Papacy has proceeded, not from her open enemies, not from Protestant nations and peoples, but from her own children. As predicted nearly two thousand years ago, and long ere this false Church had dawned into existence, she was to be destroyed by the ten kingdoms with whom she had committed spiritual fornication, under the special presidency of the identical Beast who had been rendering her homage and protection; and so it is, that Italians, Frenchmen, Spaniards, and Portuguese, Latin children of the Latin Empire, have combined to expel Babylon the Great from her place, as mother and mistress amongst them. They having embraced the infidel dogmas of the revolution, and democracy, conspire, under the chief impersonator of those principles, to overthrow all that is *called* God, or that is worshipped. And so Rome has fallen, or will fall; and whilst legitimists, and exiled monarchs may mourn, and the traffickers of her spiritual wares lament, there will be great rejoicing in heaven, for "in her is found the blood of saints and of prophets, and of all slain upon the earth."

Having intimated that the French Emperor has modified his relations with the Papacy, as *virtually* to have done with her, I have but to produce, according to my invariable custom, those substantial evidences, out of a vast accumulation at hand, which speak the facts so plainly as to place the subject beyond question,

—evidences which, handed down to posterity, will be the wonder and astonishment of generations to come. It had been rumoured for some time preceding the act itself, that the Emperor would one day withdraw his protection from the Sovereign Pontiff, and had entered into an arrangement with Italy for that purpose; still, few believed it. Even the Pope appears to have doubted its reality, and affected astonishment when the announcement of the fatal news fell upon his unwilling ears. But this great change ought not, however, to have taken *anyone* by surprise, since it had been talked about for years, and only delayed, as it would seem, until such time as the newly-revived Imperial democracy was strong enough to exist without the prop of priestly support, and in spite of the malice of priestly animosity. As early as 1860, the *Standard*, in a leader, suggested the true cause of the Papal troubles:—"Whatever misfortunes have since befallen the Pope are due to the alliance between France and Sardinia, and it is rather too much to expect the Pope to be warmly attached to *his destroyer*."—*Standard*, 20th March, 1860.

In 1861, several very ominous forebodings of the impending doom, appeared in print. The *Times* of the 12th January, contained in its columns the following singular contribution from the pen of the Marquis de Laroche Jacquelin:—

"The Emperor Napoleon must become the *Apostate*, call himself Vicar of our Lord on earth, and all kings must convince us that they are the successors of the Apostles, uniting the spiritual and temporal powers to bind and loose on the earth; for unity in the Catholic faith will not exist the day the spiritual chief has no longer authority over every will and every belief of the same religion. It means simply that the Catholic religion is to be effaced from the world."

On the 25th February, in the same year, the *Standard* published, what purported to be an allocution of the Pope, on the occasion of the Lent preachers being admitted to the honour of kissing his slipper, according to an ancient custom:—

"In the space of two nights all the truth has become known to me! I know that, on account of the scandals which fill the sanctuary, the wrath of God is about to fall on us! Those who

long for the blood of priests will be able to satisfy their thirst. Unexampled crimes will be committed! Against the rock on which I am seated men will rush, hoping to destroy it; but they will only free it from the dross which has accumulated on it, and it will then crush them!"

The same newspaper, on the 1st of March, gave its readers a translated portion of Bishop Dupanloup's remarkable pastoral, broadly and significantly comparing the Emperor to Pontius Pilate; and, under this weak disguise, charging upon Louis Napoleon the sole responsibility of destroying the Papacy. It is a most powerful composition:—

"The *mystery of iniquity proceeds*. What would you say of a son who should thus publicly address his father:—'Father, your eldest son declares to you in the face of the whole world, that you are obstinate and ungrateful, and that but for the unchangeable respect he bears you he would abandon you to-morrow to the sad fate which your stubbornness and blindness deserve?' Obstinate! Is he not obstinate, on the contrary, who persists in eternally bringing forward over and over again impossible combinations, plans scouted as ridiculous by all politicians? Pilate, seeing that he made no way, but that, on the contrary, the exigencies of those around him grew more and more imperative, and understanding that after having hitherto yielded to all the dictates of the mob he was about to be led to an act of supreme weakness, ordered water to be brought, and, washing his hands, said, 'I am innocent of the blood of this just man.' That over, having scourged Jesus, he gave him up to the Jews that they might crucify him. But has posterity ratified the absolution given to himself by Pilate, and has the water poured over his hands cleansed them of the blood upon them in the eyes of future ages? Listen. That man, branded with the Deicial stigma—that man thus nailed to the pillory of our symbol—is neither Herod, nor Caiaphas, nor Judas, nor any of the Roman or Jewish executioners. That man is Pontius Pilate, and that is but justice; Herod, Caiaphas, Judas, and the others have had their share in the crime, but after all nothing would have come to pass without Pilate. Pilate might have saved Christ, and

without him Christ could not have been put to death. The signal could only come from him. Wash thy hands, O Pilate; declare thyself innocent of the death of Christ; we will reply, and to the end of time posterity will reply with us—that Christ suffered under Pontius Pilate.”

In 1862, Prince Napoleon, at the imminent risk of discovering the *real* policy of the Emperor to his opponents, delivered a very plain speech in the French Senate on the Papal question:—

“Napoleon III. himself is influenced, perhaps, in spite of himself, by this idea of Italian unity. When he left for Italy, the Emperor, in a proclamation, in which he spake from the fulness of his heart, said that Italy must be free from the Alps to the Adriatic—Italy was to be restored to herself and become a united nation. Are these expressions explicit enough? The Emperor wished to restore Italy to herself; he proclaimed Italian unity. How can you, therefore, affect surprise at that wish being now realised, by our surrendering that small portion of territory which is still wanting to complete her unity, *Rome and the surrounding territory*. I know that you will reply—and Venice? But our soldiers are not at Venice, Verona, and Mantua—and if they were, I should urge their withdrawal, as I now urge their withdrawal from Rome—”

“What is the situation at present? Rome is in our hands. We are the arbiters of the Roman question. On the conduct of France in this emergency the future of Italy depends. If we remain at Rome the agitation will assume more alarming proportions. Yet an end must be put to the present state of things. It is intolerable for Italy—intolerable for France—intolerable for Europe. There is only one means, the evacuation of Rome. And looking at the present situation, have you thought of the position our gallant soldiers may have to take? Will you make them the gendarmes of a condemned power? Shall they be compelled to protect a Government which is blamed by every document issued by the Emperor’s Government? No, no! What, according to me, the Government should do is this. First, it should clearly stipulate all that is necessary to secure to the Holy Father his spiritual independence, dignity,

and honour—it is no business of mine to indicate on what bases this should be done. That is the work of statesmen in their closet. This done the Government should notify its intentions, and having thus reassured Catholic consciences, evacuate Rome. The Pope would then remain alone with his people, and in the event of passions exciting disturbances, compromising for the safety of his Holiness, let us give him the assurance that Italian soldiers will be able to defend him whenever he summons them to his aid. What I tell you is frank at least. When the Pope finds himself alone with the Romans he will make up his mind. If he leaves Rome it will be a great misfortune, no doubt; it will disturb many consciences; but the disturbance will, I am convinced, be only temporary. Remember the lessons of history. The Court of Rome yields to necessity; but nothing short of it. Let us inform it of our decision respectfully, but energetically, and it will yield. It will not be under the influence of fear alone—oh! no. There are circumstances when reason must necessarily prevail; and time will bring about the compromise which the Emperor wishes to effect between Italy and the Pope, for it is not possible that some Divine ray of peace, of conciliation, should not fall upon the Holy Father, to inspire him, to suggest to him, to prefer his dignity, his honour, his spiritual independence to a rag (*lambeau*) of temporal power, always disputed, preserved—and at what price? and which he must perforce lose some day. What I ask, then, is, that the Emperor should speak out. Let him make up his mind—it is time he should; the question is ripe; it has been argued, it must now be judged. Yes, I have the fullest confidence in the Government of the Emperor, and here I do not speak for the present, *but for the future*, at the risk of being disavowed by the Government Commissioners. I care not. I have full confidence that the Italian question will be settled in favour of unity; that the settlement cannot be different under Napoleon III. from what it was under Napoleon I.; that the spiritual must be divided from the temporal power, and the shadow and the genius of the Great Emperor will inspire the decisions of his successor.”

Published in *Standard* of 4th March, 1862.

Later on in this same year, (September 14th), Signor Achille Gennarelli communicated, in a letter to the Viscount La Gueronniere, an Italian view of the Emperor's Roman Policy, proving that, however ignorantly impetuous and impatient of the Emperor's treatment of a most delicate question, a large section of the Italian nation might be, there have ever been some who from the first appreciated his gradual and cautious policy, assured of Italy's ultimate triumph under the tutoring care of the revived Napoleon:—

“I consider, sir, that your ideas are a perfect antithesis to the Napoleonic ideas, and that you, if not the victim of a mistake very extraordinary in a Frenchman—an ex-minister, an ex-director of the press, and a senator—are working for a party. I, albeit not a Frenchman, have somewhat studied the life of your Emperor, and the study affords these peculiarities—an irresistible perseverance in his designs, a *profound dissimulation as to his views*, an unequalled patience in carrying them out, a fearful passiveness before obstacles, and a power over his passions the equal of which is not to be found in history. Now, reflect a little. We have two letters of the Emperor; one dated 1836, in which he says that General Magnan was a man of action, who should some day be a marshal of France. Seventeen years later, after two hasty trials, after seven years' imprisonment, after an exile of thirty-five years, Louis Napoleon became Emperor, and General Magnan was a marshal of France! In 1834 he fought for Italy, and with his brother wrote a letter to the Holy See requiring the abdication of the temporal power. The Holy See returned an insulting answer. Louis Napoleon waited twenty-eight years, and replied to the Court of Rome by the battle of Solferino, and by some words addressed to General Cialdini and Signor Farini. Romagna, the Marches, and Umbria, are no longer portions of the pontifical dominions. But the punishment inflicted by the Emperor on the enemies of human advancement who rule at Rome was still more terrible. He would not destroy them; he wished them to destroy themselves. Perceiving that they had lost their senses, and that they were offering to the world a spectacle of

ferocity, he sent his soldiers, not to restrain them like the First Napoleon, but to preserve their liberty of action, so that they should expose themselves in their nudity, and let nations see to what an outrageous point the sceptred priest of Rome would advance! The world saw the proscriptions, the military executions, the prisons, the blood, the tyranny, the boy Mortara, the persecutions of civilisation and of the Gospel. History registered it all, and the *sceptre of the Popes is broken in the judgment of men, as in the judgment of God. Napoleon III. was the instrument of eternal justice.* He can only wish now what he wished then—what Italy requires, what is in the designs of providence! Sir, between your views and the precedents of the Emperor, there is a deep abyss!”—Quoted in *Daily Telegraph*, 24th September, 1862.

The *Daily Telegraph*, in a leader dated 8th October, 1864, commented on the text of the French convention with Italy, and admitted that the doom of the Papacy was thereby pronounced:—

“We now have the text of a treaty destined to be one of the most notable in the history of religion and humanity. That something of the kind was inevitable—that irresistible forces impelled the imperial author of the Franco-Italian Convention to some such momentous step—does not lessen the interest, we had almost said the solemnity, of the compact. Those who know how to read between the lines can see written there the ‘Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin,’ which slowly but surely dooms at last the temporal power so infelicitously usurped by the head of the Roman Church. The shadow of approaching death falls at last upon that baneful and suicidal Royalty, which, if like some Eastern poison-trees, it bore wholesome leaves at first, has with its latter day fruits drugged the hearts and souls of mankind into spiritual sickness. That we do not go beyond the limits of a just interpretation here is confirmed by a fact which most of all will recommend the convention to the English public. It is bitterly unwelcome to the Vatican; the cardinals are in despair about it; the Holy Father can find no resource upon the subject but prayers, which curiously enough, in place of being the first resort,

have always, yielding precedency to Swiss Guards and diplomacy, been the very last weapon of trembling Pontiffs."

In 1865, a speech, attributed to Prince Napoleon, was published by the *Standard*, and it is as complete an admission of all I am attempting to prove, as could well be written:—

"What MM. Emile Ollivier and La Guéronnière counsel, is the ancient and traditional policy which has been shown too much consideration for the last twelve years. Men should look higher and farther. The French Empire is the triumph of modern democracy—of the revolution which was impeded by fifteen years' restoration and eighteen of parliamentary liberalism, but which burst over all these powerless impediments. Too much hesitation and prudence have been hitherto shown; France ought to have allied herself frankly to Prussia and Italy a year ago; and the hour has now arrived when the flag of the revolution, that of the Empire, ought to be widely displayed. What is the programme of that revolution? It is, at first, *the struggle commenced against Catholicism—a struggle which must be continued and carried out*—it is the constitution of the great national unities, on the wrecks of factitious states, and of the treaties which founded them—it is democracy triumphant, having for basis universal suffrage, but which requires for a century to be directed by the strong hands of the Cæsars—it is Imperial France at the summit of this European situation—it is war, a long war, as the condition and instrument of that policy. Such are the programme and the flag. But the first obstacle to overcome is Austria. Austria is the most powerful support of the Catholic influence in the world; she represents the federative form as opposed to the principle of separate nationalities; she wishes to bring about the triumph at Vienna, Pesth, and Frankfort of the liberal and parliamentary institutions opposed to democracy; she is the last refuge of Catholicism and feudality; she must therefore be borne down and crushed. The work commenced in 1859; it must be finished at present. Imperial France ought, therefore, to remain the enemy of Austria; she ought to be the friend and the support of Prussia, the country of the great Luther, and which attacks Austria both by her ideas and her

arms ; she ought to sustain Italy, who is the actual centre of the revolution in the world, until France shall become so, and to whom is confided the mission of overthrowing Catholicism at Rome, as Prussia has that of destroying it at Vienna."

The fatal year 1866 arrived, the French faithfully carried out their arrangement with Italy, and the Papacy was left alone, waiting for some sudden outbreak to end her mummeries for ever. Wild and furious were the lamentations and recriminations consequent upon this forsaking. The Pope at last seizing the opportunity to stigmatise the Emperor as non-christian, or anti-christian, and to express his great dread of the revolution. His farewell speech to the French officers, according to the Roman Correspondent of the *Journal des Debats* ran as follows :—

"On the eve of your departure I am here, my dear children, to receive your farewell. Your flag came from France with the mission to uphold the rights of the Holy See, and it is now about to return. I desire that it may be received with the same feeling as when it left. I am informed that all Catholic hearts are alarmed ; they tremble in thinking of the difficulties in which the Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Head of the Catholic Church, will be placed. We must not indulge in illusions. The revolution will come here ; it has been proclaimed over and over again. An Italian personage in a high position has said that Italy was made, but not completed. Italy would be unmade if there was still here a corner of the earth where order, quietness, and tranquillity reigned. They want to come here to hoist the flag, on the capital. You know as well as I do that the Tarpeian rock is not far distant. Six years ago I was speaking with a representative of France. I charged him to tell the Emperor that St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, which is now included in the French Empire, frightened at the disasters which he foresaw while the barbarians were besieging the city, asked of the Lord that he should die rather than be a witness of them. The representative replied that the barbarians should not enter here. But he is not a prophet. Another person said to me that Rome could not be the capital of a kingdom, and that it could only be the capital of all Catholics. But I dread the revolution.

What can be done? What can be said? I am entirely without resources. Yet I am tranquil, for the greatest power of all, God, gives me force and firmness.

“Go, and carry with you my blessing and my paternal adieu. If you see the Emperor of the French, your Emperor, tell him that I pray for him. They say that his health is not good; I pray for his health. They say that his soul is not tranquil; I pray for his soul. The French nation is a Christian nation; its head must also be Christian. With prayer, accompanied by confidence and perseverance, this nation, so great and so powerful, will be enabled to obtain what it desires. As for me, I live in the mercy of God; and my blessing will accompany you on your journey home.”—*Times*, 13th December, 1866.

A certain M. de Fallouse, in an article in the “*Correspondant*,” gave expression to the virulent feelings of the French clerical party, very much in sympathy with their Ecclesiastical Chief on this momentous occasion:—

“A crime, which has found its place among the *causes célèbres*, offers the harrowing spectacle of a victim coldly and slowly watched by his murderer. All is slowly and noiselessly prepared; the locks removed; the bell-pulls cut; one window open, to give the police a wrong clue; and when the law officers visit the premises they see on the walls the bloody marks of the victim’s hands, feeling for the bell. The victim is Pius IX.—the victim of a hateful plot got up by the Revolutionists, who have blocked up all the issues, taken all measures to prevent adequate aid being rendered, and to stifle the shrieks of the Papacy in its death-throes.”—Quoted in *Standard*, November 29th, 1866.

Cardinal Cullen rushed with heavy words to the rescue, and, with wonderful clearness, summed up the process of Papal Rome’s destruction, as plotted by the Emperor and the revolution:—

“The spirit of revolution is triumphant in almost every country in Europe, and has destroyed the power of the Catholic States. There is no friendly Power now capable of supporting the head of the Church, or of maintaining the doctrines and practices of our holy religion. Austria was the last able to do

so, and Austria is now overthrown. The condition, then, of the Pope is this, that his territory has been reduced to a very small spot in Italy. Nearly everything has been taken from him. *The Emperor of the French very kindly held the hands of the Pope whilst his enemies were stripping him of the patrimony of St. Peter,* and now, having reduced the Holy Father to a state of temporal weakness, and all the Catholic Powers willing to assist him being either revolutionized or weakened, the Emperor of the French abandons Rome, and leaves the people to the mercy of the Italian revolutionists, to the mercy of men who avow the deadliest hatred to the Pope and to religion, and who will not hesitate, on the first opportunity, notwithstanding the Convention, to seize upon Rome and destroy the Pope's authority. It is very probable that within six months this crisis may come, and his Holiness be reduced to such a condition that he may not know where to turn his steps. In these circumstances our attachment to him must be increased."—*Daily News*.

At the meeting of a Roman Catholic Society, called the "Confraternity of St. Peter," held on purpose "to express attachment, and fidelity, to the person and office of the Pope, at the present critical juncture," several important speeches were made; all confirmatory of the cause of Papal decline, and the instrument of Papal destruction. One speaker (Mr. Henry Matthews), "denounced *the Emperor Napoleon as the man likely to go down to posterity as the Pontius Pilate of the Papacy,* and as the incarnation of despotism and revolution." Another (Lord Arundel, of Wardour), gave it as his opinion, "that if the glory of the Papacy were destroyed, the Christian world would look back from the dead level of *democracy, and misery,* to the splendour and happiness of the past." A third (Mr. John Cashel Hoey) described the "Holy Father, after a pontificate of twenty years in perpetual and inflexible conflict with anti-social and *anti-Christian revolution,* as standing alone, without human aid, in the midst of those who, by violence and intrigue, are labouring to destroy the temporal sovereignty."—*Daily Telegraph*, 7th Dec., 1866.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* of 28th December, 1866, recorded in one of its columns some news from Rome, under the heading "The

Pope and Madame Pilate," being the notice of an article "from the pen of Father Margotti, familiarly called Don Margotto, chief editor of the *Unità Cattolica* of Turin. The article is entitled 'La Moglie di Pilato' (the wife of Pilate), and draws a parallel, as adroit as caustic, between the spouse of Napoleon III. and Claudia Procula, wife of the famous governor of Judæa, who washed his hands of the blood of Jesus. This pious diatribe, the wit and vigour of which will destroy the sleep of M. Veuillot, has produced an extraordinary sensation at Rome, and thrown the temporalists into ecstasies. Its language, however, is energetically repudiated by the Liberal cardinals and prelates, and even by many of the moderate clergy, who hold the opinion that satire is not an effective weapon for defending a religious cause, and that it is especially unsuited to the present situation of the Holy See. But this does not lessen the exultation of the ultras, and the Zouaves now only speak of the Empress as 'Madame Pilate.'"—*Pall Mall Gazette*, December 28th, 1866.

Not wishing to omit *any* testimony, from important witnesses, of this almost marvellous transaction; I must quote a few sentences from the Roman Catholic Archbishop Manning's Pastoral, issued on 30th September, 1866, full of fears respecting the fatal moment so shortly afterwards to arrive. He first discusses and allows the fact that the Papacy had for eighteen years been resting (riding) on France, and then turns to that ugly and contradictory convention, which threw the woman from the back of her champion down into the depths of desertion and forgetfulness, and which the more recent return of the French troops will not vitally reverse:—

"To France has been conceded in these eighteen years the high dignity and grace of protecting the Vicar of Jesus Christ from the anti-social, anti-Christian power of modern revolution; a noble task which other Catholic Powers would rejoice to fulfil; but by a traditional privilege, and a kind of Catholic primogeniture, it is the inheritance and the glory of France, to execute the will of the Catholic world in the protection of Rome. Two years ago a convention was made between the Sovereigns of France and

Italy, without the knowledge of the Sovereign Pontiff, who of all men ought first to have been possessed of that knowledge, to the effect that after two years the armies of France should be withdrawn from their Christian mission, and should abdicate the traditional office which Charlemagne bequeathed to his successors. It was agreed that the Vicar of our Lord should be left weak, isolated, defenceless, in the midst of the Revolution. That convention expired on the 15th of this month, but its execution is not to be completed until next December. This interval of time, therefore, is full of expectation. There is not a Christian Power in the world to stay its execution, or to come between the contracting parties in this abandonment of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. The principle of human non-intervention has its full development. Treaties, contracts, engagements, rights of justice, all international laws and obligations have been long ago broken up and buried. The Powers of Christian Europe looked on in silence. The principle of modern nationalism, after rending asunder the fair political order of the Christian world, has reached at length to the order of the Christian Church. It has for three centuries assailed its unity. It now assails its authority. It rent nations from its body; it now aims at its Head. Christendom must be silent because its centre is in Italy. But its circumference traverses all nations; and all are equally near to their common centre. Italian nationalism is more sacred to the statesmen of to-day than the unity and authority of Christendom, or the purity and freedom of the Church. The inspirations of the revolution have poisoned their counsels and paralyzed their action. The sacred diplomacy of Christendom is effaced from the laws of nations. Christian unity must give way before national isolation, and the decomposition of Christian Europe is to be accomplished. The work of the Revolution—that is, of society without Christ and without God, is to be supreme. ‘The kingdom of this world’ was the kingdom ‘of our Lord and His Christ’ (Apoc. xi., 15.) But the civil Powers of the world are now desecrating themselves one by one; and the temporal power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ is therefore intolerable to them. It reminds them whence they are fallen,

and it must be destroyed. And there is no human power to stay the hand uplifted to destroy it."—*Times*, October 3rd, 1866.

How the Papal Whore, by her own confession, confirms all that the Scriptures tell us! She admits, in the plainest words, that her destruction has been brought about by an "anti-Christian" power, which she calls the "MYSTERY OF INIQUITY." She declares that system of wickedness to be the "Liberalism" of the day—the revolution—the democracy, of which the Napoleons are the sovereign representatives. She stigmatises the French Emperor as the Pontius Pilate, and the Judas of the Papacy. And now let us accept her evidence on another point of recognition, viz.,—that, deserted by her former paramours, they combine to overthrow her. And if all this testimony should fail to convince any reader that the Church of Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse, then, verily, such a soul must be past any belief—a hardened, miserable ruin, self-immolated at the shrine of an insensate scepticism; and altogether beyond the pale of Christian society. That evidence which I now produce, is well described by the paper which copied it from the "TABLET," *the organ of the Roman Catholic party in England*, as "a blasphemous and ribald parody on the most solemn records in the life of our Saviour." Yet is it a most unequivocal admission of that Bible prophecy, "These shall hate the Whore," which could possibly be given us:—

"Pius IX. before the Congress which is announced will be held in Paris, anno 1860. *The French Emperor*: Behold the man! What think ye? *England*: Away with him! away with him! Crucify him! *Sweden*: Thou hast said it. He is deserving of death. *Austria*: What evil hath he done? *Sardinia*: We have a law, and according to this law he must die. *Prussia*: I find no cause in him. *Spain*: I am innocent of the blood of this just man. *Portugal*: Why this waste? *Russia*: What is that to us? Look you to it. *Naples*: Although all should be scandalised in thee, I will not be scandalised. *The French Emperor*: Hail, Rabbi! (the spirit, indeed, is willing, but the flesh is weak). It is expedient that one man should die for the people. *The French Empress*: Have thou

nothing to do with that just man, for I have suffered much in a dream concerning him. *The Christian People*: Woe to that man by whom he shall be betrayed! *All the Sovereigns*: Surely he hath borne our sorrows, and carried our sins. *Bishops and Priests*: Be of good heart, for the time is at hand when God will deliver them. *The Pope*: Sit ye here while I go and pray. After three days I shall rise again, and blessed is the man who shall not have been scandalised in me."—*Cornish Times*, February 18, 1860.

France alone, without the concurrence of the peoples of the other Roman Catholic States, could not have succeeded in her boasted mission of destroying the Papacy. She could not have invaded Italy, and driven out the Austrian forces, had not the Italians themselves been willing; and therefore it behoves us to look around for the reason of this tremendous overthrow of a system, which had held such undisputed sway over the hearts and consciences of the Latin race, for so long a period; and why the Latin peoples so willingly consent to the leadership of France, and her Emperor, in the work of infidel consolidation in which they are so busily engaged, and which lies at the root of all their hatred towards the Papacy. The Apocalyptic vision states plainly enough that the ten horns, or kingdoms, after being subjected to the spell and fascination of the spiritual Whore, would at last rebel against her influence, voluntarily give their power and strength unto the Beast, and under his presidency hate the Woman, and destroy her. And this is true history, since the events thus foretold in the first century, are, even now, happening in the nineteenth, under our very eyes. The Latin nations have, without doubt, embraced the doctrines of the great French Revolution; and recognised the dynasty, which was the issue of that Revolution, commonly termed the "incarnation of the principles of 1789." To ensure the triumph of these dark theories, they have, in several cases, disposed of their ancient Sovereigns and legitimate rulers, and are joined together in a firm alliance, having for its object the proscription of kings, the establishment of popular dominion, and the total abnegation of Catholicism, and Christianity. All this wild hatred of

governments, and of religion, had its birth at the great French Revolution, in 1789; and then, really, commenced the desolation of the "Mystical Woman" by her former friends and subjects; then, by confiscation and persecution, the Church of Rome began to receive back "measure for measure;" then, in accordance with St. John's Prophecy, the Harlot enthroned on seven mountains began to experience the just reward of her doings, even "double unto her double, according to her works." France, the eldest daughter of the Church, as well as the earliest born of the revolution, was the first to betray the Roman Harlot. The foremost vengeance of the Revolution in that country was showered upon the Church; all places of worship were converted into temples, or perverted to the lowest of secular purposes. All priests were murdered, or banished, unless willing to profane their mouths with curses and blasphemy. All Church property was hopelessly confiscated, and religion positively forbidden the land. As well, also, throughout Europe, wherever the French revolutionary ideas took deep root, there was manifested the same hostility and bitterness towards Romanism, and every other modification of the Christian faith. Perhaps the story of all this exaltation of the Revolution above all called God, or that is worshipped, will be best told by those writers who lived during those sad times, or soon after the struggle came to its, alas! but temporary, close. Kett wrote his invaluable work on Prophecy, about the year 1800; and the following is his summary of the results of the French Revolution, as it affected the Papacy:—

"The last twenty years include a number of events the most adverse to the interests of the Church of Rome. The order of Jesuits, its most firm and able supporters, has been suppressed; and the inability of the sovereign Pontiff to prevent the execution of a measure so destructive to his authority, was proved by his ineffectual and degrading personal application to the Emperor Joseph. The monasteries of Germany, once filled with his most zealous adherents, are dissolved. Even Spain, once the most superstitious country in Europe, has abridged the power of its Inquisition, and pays with reluctance her accustomed tribute to the head of the Church. The French, since the era of

the Revolution, have buried the Catholic altar under the ruins of the Monarchical throne. The memorable events of the past year (1798) have accelerated her decline. The French armies have ravaged Italy, and Rome itself is become a prey to its apostate and infidel conquerors. The temporal authority of the Pope is completely subverted, and the semblance of the ancient Roman Government is established at Rome, by the democratic tyranny which reigns triumphant in its place. The Pope himself, after being exposed to repeated insults, is degraded and driven from his throne; he is divested of his honours and his state, stripped of his possessions and revenues, and reduced to the abject condition of a wanderer, and an exile. Germany, Naples, Portugal, and Spain, view his degradation with indifference, if not with approbation; and France, the country of Pepin and Charlemagne, the great founders of the Papal glory, is the instrument of his overthrow, and enriches herself with his spoils."

KETT, Vol. II., pp. 51, 52.

Elliott, in his "Horæ Apocalypticæ," Vol. III., p. 367, gives also a long and deeply interesting *resume* of the spoiling of the Papacy by the Revolution, and its chief hero, Napoleon Buonaparte. It is one of those happy portions of his laborious work, which commends itself to the reader as real history, speaking a loud and clear fulfilment of Prophecy. I shall give the quotations verbatim, omitting only such sentences as, in my humble judgment, are inconsistent with the great idea he is seeking in this place to establish:—"Significant symptoms had not been wanting for full half a century before the French Revolution, which showed the attachment of the kings to have more than grown cold towards the Pope, and a preparation of mind to have risen up within them for the overthrow of his domination, and spoliation of the Church, his associate. But as yet there was no mortal blow struck against Papal supremacy; no notable commencement of any such hating, tearing, and consuming, as by fire, of the Romish Church, with the bitterness and animosity intimated in prophecy, by the then rulers and people of the kingdoms of Western Christendom. This was reserved to the epoch of the Revolution, and to that country

which, under Clovis, 1300 years before, had first of the Western kingdoms attached itself to Rome, and of which the king thenceforward in consequence had borne the title of 'Eldest Son of the Church.'” Elliott then proceeds to narrate the work of spoliation in some of its more prominent features, as inaugurated by the National Assembly of France, constituted in 1789:— Church property appropriated as National property; abolition of tithes; monasteries suppressed; forced abjuration of allegiance to the Pope, from the Priests; and other deeds which finally issued in 1793, in the public abolition of the Romish and Christian religions, the destruction or desecration of the churches and chapels, and the massacre of not less than 24,000 of the French Clergy. “Begun in France,” Elliott continues, “the spoliation of the Harlot Church, and of its Papal patron and head, quickly spread into the other countries of Christendom. A propagandist spirit in respect of this, as in respect of its other principles, was one of the essential characteristics of the Revolution; and the tempest of war gave it wings. Its first translation was into Belgium and the Rhenish provinces of Germany; thither it brought with it ecclesiastical changes analogous to those in France. In the years 1796, 1797, French dominion being established by Buonaparte’s victories in Northern Italy, it bore with it thither the similar accompaniment, as of French democracy and infidelity, so too of French *anti-Papalism*. And then Rome itself being laid open to Buonaparte, and the French armies urging their march onwards to the Papal Capital, the Pope only saved himself, and it, by the formal cession in the treaty of Tolentino of the Legations of Ferrara, Bologna, and Romagna (Peter’s Patrimony), together with the city of Ancona; the payment of above £1,500,000 sterling; a sum multiplied three times by exactions and oppression, and the surrender of military stores, and of a hundred of the finest paintings and statues in the Vatican. The French Ambassador wrote from Rome to Buonaparte: ‘The payment of 30 millions (of francs) stipulated by the treaty of Tolentino has totally exhausted *this old carcass*: we are making it consume by a slow fire.’ It was the very language of the apocalyptic metaphor. The aged Pope himself

now left merely nominal master of some few remaining shreds of the Patrimony of Peter, experienced in person, soon after, the bitterness of the prevailing anti-papal spirit. On pretence of an insult to the French Ambassador there, a French corps d'Armée under Berthier, having in February, 1798, crossed the Appenines from Ancona and entered Rome, the tricolor flag was displayed from the Capital, amidst the shouts of the populace, the Pope's temporal reign declared at an end, and the Roman Republic proclaimed, in strict alliance and fraternization with the French. Then in the Sistine chapel of the Vatican, the ante-hall to which has a fresco painted by Papal order, commemorative of the Protestant massacre on St. Bartholomew's day, there, while seated on his throne, and receiving the gratulations of his Cardinals, on the anniversary of his election to the Popedom, he was arrested by the French military, the ring of his marriage with the Church Catholic torn from his finger, his palace rifled, and himself carried prisoner into France, only to die there in exile shortly after. The hopes of an end to these persecutions of Rome and its Harlot Church, excited by Buonaparte's restoration of the Romish religion in France, quickly proved delusive. The Romish religion was recognised by him only *in common, and on an equal footing, with other forms of Christianity.*] [I say with all these as consenting, if not co-operating parties, viz.,—Louis King of Holland, Jerome of Westphalia, the Princes of the Confederation of the Rhine, (including Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and the Swiss Cantons), the Austrian Emperor, the King of Italy, (a kingdom comprehending Savoy, Lombardy, and Tuscany), the King of Naples, too, and Kings of Spain and Portugal, altogether the representatives of *nine out of the ten horns* of the symbolic Beast of the Apocalypse. Napoleon issued from Schoebrunn and Vienna, his Decrees for the final humbling and spoliation of the Romish Church and the Pope :—Decrees of which the purport was, the revocation of Charlemagne's donations to the Holy See, the annexation of the Duchies of Urbino, Ancona, Maerata, and Camarino for ever to the kingdom of Italy, the total and final abolition of the Pope's temporal authority, and incorporation of Rome, as its second city with the French Empire." ELLIOTT, Vol. III., 369—373.

It is surpassingly strange that Elliott, whose views are at times so exceedingly clear, should fail to grasp the subject correctly, as a whole. Here he portrays the hating of the Woman by the horns, under the presidency of the Beast, and yet, he still *labours* to believe that the Pope is the Beast; as well as the Woman, and continues his unfortunate confusion of a simple and glorious subject.

Alison the historian gives a great deal of valuable information in reference to this hating of the Papacy, by the French and other revolutionists, and the reader can easily search out this information for himself; but I must quote a page from a large and important work on prophecy entitled "Armageddon," which in a short and pithy manner, thus summarises the events referred to:—

"On 12th Feb., 1791,—The Directory wrote to Napoleon, 'The possession of the Tyrol and Trieste, and the *conquest of Rome*, will be the glorious fruits of the fall of Mantua.' On 25th May, 1797, Cacault, the French Ambassador *at Rome*, wrote to Napoleon, 'I am occupied in collecting and transporting from hence to Milan, all the diamonds and jewels I can collect.' In following August, he again wrote to Napoleon, 'Discontent is at its height in the Papal States; the payment of 30,000,000 francs stipulated by treaty of Tolentino has totally exhausted this old carcase, we are making it expire by a slow fire.' At close of 1797, an order from the Directory was despatched to Joseph Buonaparte at Rome, to promote by all means in his power the approaching revolution in the Papal State. In February, 1793, the French Army took possession of Rome, the Pope was dispossessed of his authority, his repositories ransacked, his valuables stolen, himself sent to Tuscany, subsequently to Leghorn, and ultimately to Valence, where he died. The French Army pillaged the city of Rome, Churches, Convents, and Palaces of the Cardinals laid waste. Sacerdotal vestments burnt, domestic property of the Pope sold, Church property confiscated."—"Armageddon," Vol. I., p. 534.

Another writer, in a work on the history of Rationalism, confesses to all the arguments I have adduced, both in this work

and in "Anomia," as to the real cause of Papal decline. He admits that Rome's destruction as a priestly power, is pre-eminent proof of the conquering spirit of the revolution; and whilst according to her the foremost position as a theocracy in the world, he also regards her as the archetype, and representative, of the religious idea which is to be *eradicated from the hearts of men*. "The secularization of politics," renders Romish Power "an anachronism," and "the union of politics and theology" is to be a thing of the past, thereby again giving us the testimony of an unsuspecting witness to the truth of God's foreknowledge, that the last apostacy, or departure from God, should oppose and exalt 'itself above all that is called God, and against all worship.' "One of the great problems on which the thoughts of politicians are even now concentrated, is the hopeless decadence of the one theocracy of modern Europe, of the great type and representative of the alliance of politics and theology. That throne on which it seemed as though the changeless Church had stamped the impress of her own perpetuity, [that throne which was once the centre and the archetype of the political system of Europe], [that throne has in our day sunk into a condition of hopeless decrepitude, and has only prolonged its existence by the confession of its impotence. It fell before the Revolution, and has since been unable to exist, except by the support of a foreign army. The principle of its vitality has departed. It fell because it represented the union of politics and theology, and because the intellect of Europe has rendered it an anachronism by pronouncing their divorce. It fell because its constitution was essentially, and radically opposed to the spirit of an age in which the secularization of politics is the measure, and the condition of all political prosperity."—History of Rationalism in Europe, Vol. II., pp. 140—142. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A.

The first French Revolution did really effect the destruction of the "Woman of Rome;" and the kingdoms, once her friends, joined hands, with the infidel Chief of Democracy, to wrest from her all temporal dominion—with which fell also whatever spiritual influence such a Church could command; and had the

revolution permanently triumphed on that occasion, Rome Papal would never again have troubled the world with her spiritual fornication

The battle of Waterloo, in restoring kings to their thrones, and priests to their altars, kept the revolution at bay for nearly forty years; but it was not dead, neither altogether asleep. The fires of that dark plot smouldered in secret places. In masonic lodges, the principles of liberalism were preserved, and just when the world was anticipating perpetual quiet and prosperity, the eruption burst forth again, to find its course easy, and alas! successful. The old crater again vomited its sulphurous vapours, to overspread Europe. France a second time took the initiative, called to her chief place of power the very dynasty which the revolution had created, and the holy alliance proscribed; and began almost immediately to diminish the authority of the Church throughout her country, preparatory to that general and ignominious expulsion from power, which the Church of Rome is destined to experience at the hands of those with whom she had been in unholy alliance for so many centuries.

In no one respect does the government of Louis Napoleon, as the representative of European Liberalism, bear a stronger resemblance, or likeness, to that of his great predecessor, than in its persecution and destruction of the Papacy as a *temporal power*. Here, as also in so many other respects, he is the "speaking image" of the Beast that had the wound by a sword. The brute violence of the first Buonaparte, however, proved less permanently effectual than the cunning lamb-like diplomacy of the third Buonaparte is likely to be. The first wounded and maimed the woman—the third has dexterously driven his dagger to her heart.

I have already shown how, by a sort of dualistic policy, the present French Emperor has all along appeared friendly to the Papacy, at the very time he was pulling down, one by one, the supports on which that system depended. Peace on his lips, but war in his heart; and in this double character, he does most emphatically embody the real and vital principles of liberalism, or democracy; which, whilst pretending to honour

religion, virtually despises all its substantial and positive teaching; whilst magnifying the sacredness of the individual conscience, takes effectual steps to hinder all the practical results which ought to spring from sincere convictions. In 1861, the Duke d'Aumale published a pamphlet on the present government, and governor of France, in which he makes especial mention of this "double dealing" in reference to the Papacy:—

"But your policy consists up to the present time in deceiving every one, and in refusing promises and hopes to no one. You have two faces, and you show them both every day. You say to the Catholics, 'Do you not recognize me any more? I am the Government that made the expedition to Rome; that loaded the Pope with sympathy before, during, and after the war; that signed the peace of Villafranca; that reinforced the garrison at Rome by recalling its Ambassador from Turin; that alone kept its ships before Gaeta.'

"You say to the besotted partisans of the Italian Revolution—'Why do you mistrust me—me who have my troops at Rome? Have you forgotten that it was against my will I consented to the expedition to Rome? that I wrote the letter to Edgar Ney? that the peace of Villafranca has been in my hands a dead letter? that I wished a good journey to him who repaired to Castelfidardo? that I recalled, after all, my fleet from Gaeta, and that at this day the Roman States and the kingdom of Naples no longer exist?'"—Quotations from Duke d'Aumale's pamphlet, *Times*, May 8, 1861.

Liberalism or Democracy—inaugurated by the Revolution of 1789—has never ceased to oppose and "exalt itself above all that is called God, and against all worship." It has no regard for religion, no veneration for the Holy Scriptures, and cares nothing about truth. Under the artful guise of toleration and equality, it works vigorously to annihilate the aggressive spirit of Christianity; and in crushing the fervour of faith, hopes to destroy the religious idea in man. It has no scruples, and employs all means, however inconsistent, to accomplish its dark designs. On the Continent, it allies itself with Protestantism, in order to uproot Ultramontane Romanism. In England, it

leagues itself with Anti-biblical Romanism, in order to destroy the dominating influence of Protestantism. Godless and apostate, as are the principles of Liberalism, yet multitudes of professedly religious Non-conformists are branded with its infamous characteristics, solely because it gratifies their mistaken views of ecclesiastical government, and encourages a malicious spite against the Church and faith of our fathers.

Still, there is the ugly fact before us, that the principles of the Revolution of 1789, now exist triumphantly throughout Europe. In France, England, Italy, Prussia, Austria, Spain, and even in Russia, there are public characters whose views on political subjects seem identical, and in keeping with 1789. They understand one another perfectly, without manifesting any appearance of harmony, or collusion. They have the support of millions, and, under the pretence of virtue and truth, are depriving the nations of all the practical benefits of Christianity, of all the social blessedness of religious faith. They mean to destroy religion, and are succeeding wonderfully. If only the Papacy was the object of their malevolence, it might be well for Europe; but, so far as any public recognition of faith is concerned, *all* must be banished from the Liberal Utopia. I have now only to deal with the Papal subject; yet the malicious bitterness manifested by Papal Europe against the Papacy, is in itself a most striking fulfilment of Prophecy.

The Revolution would have preferred disposing of the Papacy without violence, had such a course been possible. Some years since, one Edmund About, a French writer, produced a series of essays in a French newspaper, strongly recommending the removal of the Papacy from Rome to Jerusalem; and in 1856, the Abbé L. H. Michou, himself a Catholic Prelate, published a pamphlet strongly urging such a change of locality. But always immovable, the Pope remained, and still remains, to experience all the intrigue and spite of the revolutionary powers, leagued together for his destruction. These delicate persuasions not being received with favour, the Pope was advised to turn Liberal, and so to transmogrify his Government, as to make it capable of reconciliation with the Revolution; but still the

“Non possumus” of Pius IX. rendered all attempts at peaceable compromise utterly vain, making the use of violence, on the part of the revolutionists, absolutely imperative, if their work of impiety was to proceed.

I have neither time nor space, on this occasion, to work up a complete digest of all the particular acts of the Latin Nations, by means of which they have exhibited their recent antagonism to the false Church of Rome, but I have reserved a few published evidences from France and Italy, Austria, &c., which reveal, unmistakably, the vehemence of that hate; which God foresaw, and foretold, would annihilate this wanton Roman Harlot.

France, as the initiative nation, leads the way in her opposition to the Papacy, and has largely diminished the power of the Priests within the precincts of her Empire. For several years past, the French Government has boldly kept down all arrogance or interference of the Papacy, in matters connected with the State. In 1859, the Emperor permitted the invasion of the Pontifical States by the Italians, without opposition, and by thus withholding his help, incurred the severe anger of the Holy Father; and the Priesthood throughout France seemed disposed to resent the injury, until brought to their senses by a spirited circular from the Minister of Public Instruction, M. Rouland—thus noticed in the newspapers:—

“The *Moniteur* of yesterday publishes a circular addressed by M. Rouland, the Minister for Public Instruction, to the archbishops and bishops of France, enumerating the customs, laws, and principles which, since a distant period, have established in France the incontestable authority of the Church over the religious society in independence of the State, which is the regulator of civil and political society:—

“The Minister recalls the conduct of the Emperor since 1849, who has accorded to the Church great confidence and liberty, and has never made use of the prohibitions of our special laws in reference to it. The Emperor, however, will not permit this liberty, which had been conceded in the interest of public welfare, to become an expedient of agitation. The Minister reminds the bishops, &c., that the disagreement between the Emperor

and the Pope does not refer to religious, but only to temporal questions. To excite civil discord would be a deplorable fault of the religious class. The Minister acknowledges that the immense majority of the clergy have known how to escape such dangerous ground, but expresses his regret that some priests have abused the liberty of the pulpit to make offensive allusions and culpable provocations. The country condemns such outbursts of passion. The Minister hopes that the bishops will bring back to the way of the Gospel and to their duty the men who had departed from it. If the clergy owes veneration to the Pope, it owes respect and fidelity to the Emperor. Thus disorder, compromising religion, and prejudicial to public peace, will be prevented. The Emperor will always be happy to protect the French clergy, but he energetically wills that the laws be maintained and executed. He has the firm hope that the bishops will fulfil their mission of order, peace, and conciliation."—*Daily Telegraph*, February 21, 1860.

In 1860, went forth an appeal from Rome, for contributions from the faithful; and the French Minister of the Interior vetoed the proceeding, so far as France was concerned, by absolutely forbidding such collections:—

“PARIS, Nov. 10.

“M. le Prefect,—The Imperial Government has in no way fettered the efforts which have been made to assist the financial operations of the Pontifical Government; it authorised the negociation in France of the loan which the Pope decided to contract; it left the fullest liberty to the sympathetic manifestations which exhibited themselves in individual offerings, and those offerings have reached Rome without any obstacle. But the Government has never admitted that there could be founded without its authority throughout the empire, and as a permanent institution, committees or associations having for their object to organise, to stimulate, and to concentrate the collection of a sort of tribute for the Court of Rome.

“In a circular dated May 5, 1860, his Excellency the Minister of Public Instruction and Worship reminded the bishops what were the prescriptions and the traditions of the French law

upon this point. Nevertheless, some attempts are being made in a sense altogether contrary to the directions of that circular, and documents which have become public have announced the intention of forming an association represented by committees acting together, obedient to a common impulse, and constituting a kind of hidden institution organised in the bosom of the country.

“The Government cannot tolerate this neglect of regulations which it has laid down, this violation of laws which it has resolved should be respected. I invite you consequently, M. le Prefect, to warn the organisers and the members of these committees, if they have commenced to act in your department, that they must immediately dissolve, and you will inform them that if, notwithstanding this notice, they persist in their enterprises, they will expose themselves to the penalties decreed by the law.

“Individual donations to the Holy Father are, and will remain, free; but as to associations into the secret activity of which, political intrigues under the veil of religion may very easily glide, their existence is unlawful until after the authorisation of the Government, and that authorisation has not been granted them.—Receive, &c.,

“The Minister Secretary of State in the Department
of the Interior,

“BILLAULT.”

This proceeding of the French Government excited both attention, and comment, from our own press, full of significance. “In England, Protestant England, the land of heretics, the begging-box of the Pope is allowed free circulation, and meetings may be organised and committees formed to expedite its movements without remonstrance from Government or people. In Catholic France, however, whose people are numbered among the faithful, and whose Sovereign is the eldest son of the Romish Church, this movement of the Papacy and its agents is treated in a very different manner. The Minister of the Interior, in a circular addressed to the prefects, notices that for the ostensible purpose of collecting contributions for the Papal necessities, an association is being formed, represented by committees acting together, which he states is in violation of the laws; and the prefects are ordered to inform the organisers or

members of the said committees that they must immediately dissolve, or they will be made to suffer the penalties of disobedience. In short, the French Government, while permitting purely individual contributions, will allow of no plan or organisation for the replenishment of his Holiness's exchequer. The document will be found in our columns, and we recommend it to the attentive perusal of our readers."—*Standard*, Nov. 14, 1860.

In 1861, followed another very sharp Circular, this time from the Minister of Justice, to the Procureurs General of the Empire, which speaks for itself:—

“Monsieur le Procureur General,—For some time past divers members of the Catholic clergy have been pointed out to me, who, verbally and by writing, treat publicly, and in the exercise of their functions, of matters which the law expressly interdicts them from discussing.

“Some, forgetting that the mission of the priest is to watch over the religious instruction of the faithful, take upon themselves to criticise the acts of the Government, exciting distrust, and censuring the policy of the Emperor; others, yielding to the influence of a blind zeal, attack the person of the Sovereign, and under a veil more or less transparent, seek to overwhelm him with abuse; others, again, taking advantage of the feeble-minded and credulous, take pleasure in troubling their consciences by the announcement of imaginary evils.

“Such abuses are provided against by the law.

“Article 201 of the Penal Code ‘punishes with imprisonment of from three months to two years ministers of religion, who pronounce, in the exercise of their functions, and in a public assembly, a discourse containing criticisms or censure on the Government, on law, on an Imperial decree, or on any other act of the public authorities.’

“In terms of article 204 of the same code, ‘any writing containing pastoral instructions, in whatever form it may be, and in which a minister of religion shall meddle with, by criticism or censure, the Government or any act of public authority, shall be punished by banishment of the minister who shall have published the same.’

“If these dispositions, of which the present circumstances demonstrate the wise foresight, have not hitherto been made applicable, it is because until these latter times the attitude of the clergy has been generally respectful and reserved; it is also because the Government, in its indulgence, has chosen rather to tolerate isolated offences than to prosecute before the tribunals, to the detriment, perhaps, of religion itself, imprudent priests. But these dispositions have lost nothing of their authority, and the Government would fail in its duty if it did not employ against systematic hostility directed towards it, the arms with which it is entrusted by the law for the maintenance of peace and good order.

“I charge you consequently, Monsieur le Procureur General, to give me an exact account of all infractions which may take place within your jurisdiction, and when the facts shall be judicially established, to bring their authors, whoever they may be, before the competent authorities. It is time that the law should resume its empire.

“Receive, Monsieur le Procureur General, the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.—DELANGLE.”

Standard, April 10, 1861.

In 1862, the invitation issued by the Pope to Catholic Prelates, to gather at Rome, was expressly forbidden by this Government:—

“The Government of the Emperor has requested information at Rome respecting the pastoral letter convoking all bishops of the Christian world to Rome, for the canonisation of martyrs. This information was necessary, as the letter of convocation was published in France without having been previously communicated to the French Government.

“Cardinal Antonelli replied to the French Government that the invitation addressed to the bishops was quite a friendly one, and had no obligatory character, and was only intended to give weight to a purely religious ceremony.

“On receiving this reply the French Government expressed a wish that the bishops should not quit their dioceses, and must not ask permission to leave the empire, except in cases

where serious diocesan interests should call them to Rome.”—
From the *Moniteur*, in *Standard*, January 21, 1862.

The Toulouse Jubilee proposed by the Archbishop of that place, was also prohibited by the French Government:—

“The celebration of a jubilee has been prescribed by the Archbishop of Toulouse, in commemoration of a grievous and bloody episode of our ancient religious discords.

“The present legislation and the Concordat in reference to the performance of Catholic worship in the public streets, all impose on the Government the duty of prohibiting a ceremony which might excite division and hatred and disturb public peace. Without derogating in any way the almost immemorial custom which sanctions the so-called processions ‘of the Holy Bodies,’ the Government has decided on interdicting all the processions or ceremonies in the streets mentioned in the pastoral of the Archbishop of Toulouse.”—*Moniteur*, quoted in *Standard*, Ap. 11, 1860.

In 1861, M. Pietri, a Government official, pronounced “the temporal power of the Pope as lost.” In 1865, on 15th May, Prince Napoleon delivered himself, at Ajaccio, to the same effect:—
“Do you not perceive, from the conflicts provoked by the temporal power of the Popes, that it is now incumbent on all the partizans of liberty, and of the spirit of modern times, to carry that last fortress of the middle ages?” The following paragraph from a daily paper will also give some idea of the spirit which animated the French troops who were in charge of the Papal Capital:—

“From Rome we hear that the French garrison have been provided with about a thousand copies of their sovereign’s letter to the Pope. Great was the delight of the valiant defenders of his Holiness in seeing the object of their care put through the catechism by their inquisitive Emperor. The French soldier, you must know, is an unique specimen of a living paradox. While serving as a will-less instrument of despotism, it is yet his standing boast to despise religion, and altogether to belong to the select circle of the enlightened spirits of the age.”
—*Daily Telegraph*, Feb. 16, 1860.

And in spite of all appearances to the contrary, the *acts* of the

Emperor Napoleon are so positively adverse to the maintenance of the temporal power, that I believe recent events will but accelerate the complete destruction of Rome as the seat of the Woman.

But Italy, nearer to the heart of the evil, and more alive by bitter experience to the perniciousness of the system she is anxious to expel from power, betrays her hate of "the Woman" by a furious impatience, scarcely decent, and certainly not politic. The prolonged diplomacy of France, which alone prevents a most violent end to the Papacy, nevertheless renders more certain and permanent that divorce between Italy and the Papal Church, which of itself is an absolute barrier to the continuance of priestly supremacy at Rome. I will first notice the acts of the Italian Government, as evidencing its persistent determination to uproot the temporal power of the Pope, and to govern the newly-constituted Nationality from "Rome, the Capital of Italy." In 1860, Count Cavour demanded of the Pope, the disbanding of all the mercenary troops in his service; and on receiving a refusal, ordered the Italian army to advance, and deliberately annexed to the dominions of the king of Italy, the largest portion of the States of the Church; the French Emperor declining to defend more than Rome and its suburbs, with a population amounting only to about half-a-million,—thus leaving Italy to annex to her kingdom, Umbria, the Marches, and the province of Viterbo, with a total population of nearly 1,500,000. The opposition of the ecclesiastical authorities to this interference with the temporalities of their Church, was very quickly controlled, and several high dignitaries of the Papacy were imprisoned by order of the Italian Government:—

"We have already announced with regret that the revolutionary power in Naples had forced his Eminence Cardinal Riario Sforza, archbishop of that metropolis, to quit the kingdom in two hours' time. We have now to add that his Eminence Cardinal Caraffa, Archbishop of Benevento, was obliged to leave his flock within half an hour, and that he has arrived in Rome this morning. The reports from the Marches are not less painful. His Eminence Cardinal Antonucci, Bishop of Ancona, has been arrested by the Piedmontese and taken to a country house, where he is strictly

guarded. His Eminence Cardinal Morichini, who left Rome to go to his diocese at Jesi, has been arrested at Foglino. His Eminence Cardinal Angelio, Archbishop of Ferino, was arrested in his palace by three Piedmontese officers on the 28th of September. He was taken to Macerata, and, it is said, will be conveyed to Turin."—*Roman Journal*. Translated in *Standard*, Oct. 12, 1860.

On 31st December, 1864, a Royal decree was issued from Turin, repudiating the Papal coins as legal tender, and authorizing their refusal by all the banks in the kingdom. The great assembly of Bishops at Rome in 1862, by order of the Pope, received significant and very decided treatment by the Chamber of Deputies at Turin, and the following address to the King was proposed, and carried unanimously:—

"The Bishops assembled at Rome have cast grave insults upon our country. They have denied our national right, and have invoked foreign violence. Let us reply by proclaiming our determination to maintain intact the national right of the metropolis of our country, suffering violence at the hands of masters whom she repudiates.

"The words pronounced at the Vatican have declared all negotiations impossible. This language removes every ground for the hesitation which has long displayed the moderation of the Italian people.

"When ecclesiastics, forgetting their ministry, put forth wishes for political reaction; when ruffians carry desolation from the Pontifical territory into the southern provinces, Europe ought to be convinced that the authority of the Italian King and people only can settle the Roman question."

Standard, June 19, 1862.

Previous to this address, some questions were asked and answered in the Chamber, not without their importance:—

"Signor Petrucelli was of opinion that the Bishops, similarly to other public functionaries dependent upon the Government, ought to request leave of absence to be allowed to visit Rome. These ecclesiastics had more regard for the temporal than for the spiritual power. Rome desired to proclaim the dogma of

temporal power, and to make an appeal to the Catholic world against France. Should the Bishops go to Rome without leave of the Government, they must, on their return, become simple citizens, and lose their ecclesiastical functions.

“The Minister, Signor Poggi, replied: ‘The object of the convocation at Rome is unknown, but it is certainly not of a religious character. The Government is sufficiently armed by laws against those Bishops who should take their departure from the State, and should render themselves guilty of acts contrary to the interests of the nation. Up to the present time leave of absence has always been requested, but in case of this not taking place, the Government will consider what course to adopt.’”—*Standard*, March 17, 1862.

The separation of Church and State was suggested for consideration in one of the King’s opening addresses to his Parliament; and, so far as it might be consistent with the delicate nature of Italy’s relations to the Papacy and France, the Italian Government has strongly manifested its determination to exalt the State above the Church, and to possess Rome for its Capital. Even the Priesthood, throughout Italy, are liberal and revolutionary, seeing that they, too, wish the “temporal power” of their system abolished. One monster petition, presented by the Abbé Passaglia, and signed by no less than nine thousand Italian Priests, implored the Pope to be reconciled to the revolution, and to Italy. Another address, presented by the Clergy of Lecco, of the province of Otranto, and of forty-four neighbouring communes, was signed by seven hundred and eight priests, curés, and canons. The *Standard*, of 24th April, 1862, gave a translation of this address, as follows:—

“Blessed Father,—With all the respect which is due to the Vicar of Christ, with the affection of children for their common father, we, priests of the lower clergy of this extreme province of Italy, wish you to hear the frank and sincere language which becomes the ministers of God.

“We, poor priests of the towns and villages of the country, who are influenced neither by worldly ambition nor by the habit of command—we who live in the midst of the people, and

who know their generous aspirations, we more than all others can discern the grave disasters which threaten the Church in Italy.

“Blessed Father, there is no Christian who believes, no Italian who admits, without violating his faith, his rights, and his honour, that a divine religion, destined to conquer the universe, not by arms and blood, but with charity and the light of the evangelical word, which in the midst of the vicissitudes of time has always directed his eyes towards another life—that the Church of Christ, in a word, needs an inch of ground to sustain itself, or bayonets and soldiers to defend it.

“Your voice fifteen years ago resounded throughout Italy, and a unanimous cry was raised from all sides to bless you. The Church gained fresh life from that voice; now the Church is carried away by a terrible whirlwind, and we, the ministers of the sanctuary, hear the lamentations and groans of its sons without being able to console them; on the contrary, they curse us, they curse you, and perhaps also they will curse their mother, whom groaning they abandon. To you, then, to whom she is specially confided, we commend the Church. A word from you will dry her tears and heal her wounds; and your blessing would finish the work of the unity and independence of Italy. Crown at the Capital the most honest of kings, Victor Emmanuel! Your name will then be blessed; the Church would flourish again in all its glory; peace would return to this Italy, which is your country also. Though you reigned no longer upon an earthly throne, you would have a throne more beautiful, more glorious, one worthier the chief of the Church—a throne of love in the hearts of all your children.”—*Standard*, April 24, 1862.

The people of Italy have been less guarded than the Government in their antagonistic sentiments, and have proclaimed the Papacy a pest, and an evil, that shall be swept, sooner or later, ruthlessly away. When the French protected the more immediate suburbs of Rome in 1860, they occupied a few places where Victor Emmanuel had already been declared King; amongst others Acquapendente, and the following protest was issued and deli-

vered to the French Commandant by the Provisional Commission that had been established there:—

“Monsieur le Commandant,—The arrival of the French troops under your orders places us under the necessity of abandoning our town, that we may not see clerical government restored by you. We are also compelled to furl our flag—that flag which a year ago floated side by side with yours—in order that it may not be exposed to insult under the protection of your glorious armies. As administrators of this place, elected by the people to govern in the name of our magnanimous king, Victor Emmanuel, we have ever respected all opinions; life and property were never safer than they have been in our time. Being now constrained by force to emigrate, and yielding only to the demonstration of a friendly flag, we retire with the confident hope that justice will promptly be done when our cry shall reach the ears of your magnanimous Emperor, and that our prayers and those of the population will be heard. If in this hope we should be deceived, we should have no choice but to fly, ourselves and our children, to some free land; for we would burn down the house of our fathers rather than live in it under the bad government of the priests.

“Receive the assurance of our high consideration.

“The Provisional Municipal Commission,

“G. TAURELLI SALEMBINI, G. BATISTA GINI SILVIO
“Acquapendente, Nov. 2.” BUNDI, G. PARCHINI.

In the month following the renewed championship of Rome by France, an address (in French) to the Emperor Louis Napoleon, was circulated throughout Italy, and numerously signed; also translated in the *Standard* of December, 1860:—

“TO HIS MAJESTY THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH.

“Sire,—Italy is reborn. Her nationality is now a fact. Yesterday we were 8,500,000 Sardinian subjects; we are to-day, 22,000,000 of Italians grouped around one flag. And that has been achieved by popular instinct, without a single disorder, without any symptom of anarchy to destroy the effect of our tricolour.

“There is a last step for us to take. We will take it.

“But, sire, for this last step your concurrence is necessary; a peaceful concurrence, easy, as it does not demand the smallest sacrifice from France, and nevertheless glorious for her and decisive for Italy. Sire, withdraw your troops from Rome.

“Let the Italian question be removed by you from the shifting and arbitrary ground of fact to be placed on that of national right. Let the inviolability of that right and of the Italian territory be taken out of the domain of force, to be placed on the guarantee of a principle. May this principle be recognised by Europe, and may France, sire, be the first to give a noble example of it.

“Rome, sire, is necessary to us. It is our sacred act, our pledge of unity in love. It is from the top of the Seven Hills that we see spread out all our historic traditions. Before the triple world which it encloses within its walls everything which would murmur a threat of municipalities, or even echo of our middle age, is silent, and bows. It is of Rome that that man of genius, who was your uncle, said that in a future, more or less remote, it would be the capital of Italy.

“Sire, you have yourself approached near to that future. You would not wish—you cannot maintain the negation of this signed in the name of France at Rome.

“This negation, sire, tends to the destruction of your work and of ours. It sows the seeds of perpetual war. It hinders us from answering to the enemies which we now have, and to those which may to-morrow rise up against us—‘In the name of eternal right, the Italian soil belongs only to Italy—withdraw.’ It plants a germ of hatred between two nations which God calls to understand each other, and unitedly to go forward on the path of duty and of right.

“Sire, destroy this germ, and allow us to accomplish our own work.

“Religion, Italy, your fame, will gain by this. Religion is murdered when she is sustained, not by devoted hearts, but by foreign bayonets. Italy will no longer be condemned to creep along, from battle to battle, but will peacefully fulfil her task of unification. And Europe will learn that it is not to conquer, but

to emancipate, that France sometimes places her foot on the soil of Italy.

“In the name of right, in the name of Italy, in the name of France, sire, remove your troops from Rome. Such is the view of those who address you ; it is the cry (hitherto suppressed only by hope) of the whole of Italy.”

Garibaldi's violent harangues are noteworthy evidences of the decay, or even complete collapse of Papal influence, throughout Italy. In November, 1860, the general presented new colours to his Hungarian corps at Naples, and took occasion to vilify the Pope King :—

“This is a beautiful day (he said)—a great day. It is beautiful, it is great, because it binds together with a new tie the fraternity which unites Italy to Hungary. Free people are bound together. Free Italians cannot, ought not, will not forget it. (Here the people broke into a storm of applause.) Italians free—yes, all shall be free—and that quickly. From a life consecrated altogether to the cause of nationality, I have gathered nothing else. I desire nothing more than the right of telling the truth at all times—telling it alike to the powerful and the people. Hear me, then, generous people of this great and beautiful metropolis, and if I deserve anything of you, hear my words. The canker and ruin of our country has always been personal ambition. It is still so. It is personal ambition which blinds the Pope King, and urges him to oppose the national movement, so grand, so noble, so pure—yes, so pure that it is unique in the history of the world. It is the Pope who retards the moment of the complete liberation of Italy. The sole obstacle, the true object is this. I am a Christian, and I speak to Christians. I am a good Christian, and I speak to good Christians. I love and venerate the religion of Christ, because Christ came into this world to rescue humanity from the slavery for which God did not create it. But this Pope, who wishes that men should be slaves, who asks from the powerful of the earth fetters and chains for the Italians,—this Pope King does not know Christ ; he lies against his own religion. In the Indies they recognise and adore two genii—that of Good and Evil.

The genius of Evil for Italy is the Pope King. Let no one misunderstand my words; let no one confound Paganism with Christianity—the religion of liberty with the avaricious and bloody policy of slavery. Repeat that—repeat it—it is your duty. You who are here, a portion of the educated and cultivated population, it is your duty to educate the people, educate it to be Italian. Education gives liberty; educating the people means the power to assure and defend its independence. On a strong and healthy education of the people depend the liberty and the grandeur of Italy.”—*Times*, November 8, 1860.

Writing to the “Neapolitan Working Man’s Association,” in 1861, he again emphasises Italian hatred of the Church of Rome, in a most extraordinary manner:—

“I accept with pleasure the post of your honorary president.

“Yours is the first centre of population in Italy. You should precede the robust and laborious classes in other parts of the peninsula. Mutual reliance must cement that indissoluble unity without which liberty and prosperity cannot exist.

“Christ made all men and peoples equal, and we ought to be good Christians.

“But we should be guilty of a sacrilege were we to persevere in the religion of the priests of Rome. They are the most ferocious amongst Italy’s enemies, and the most to be dreaded. Away, then! out with this contagious and pernicious sect! Our priests should be Christian—they must not have the religion of our foes. The *Re-galant’uomo* at any price! But away with the vipers from the Eternal City, without which Italian unity cannot exist!”

Other Italian patriots have not been behind Garibaldi, either, in anathematising the Papacy. General Pinelli, when commanding troops operating in the Abruzzi, issued an order of the day so bitter in its expression of resentment towards the Roman Church, as rendered his removal from command, by the, then, Sardinian Government, absolutely necessary:—

“Officers and soldiers,—You have accomplished much; but nothing is done so long as anything remains to do. A remnant of that race of robbers is still lurking in the mountains; hasten

to dislodge them, and be as inexorable as fate. Towards such enemies mercy is a crime. Mean and submissive when they see us in numbers, no sooner do they see us weak than they traitorously attack us from behind, and massacre our wounded. Indifferent to all political principles, eager only for booty and rapine, they are for the moment the salaried brigands of the vicar, not of Christ, but of Satan, ready to sell their poinards to any others when the gold extorted from the stupid credulity of the faithful shall no longer suffice to satisfy their greed. We will annihilate them; we will crush the sacerdotal vampire which with its foul lips has for centuries sucked the blood of our mother; we will purify with fire and sword the regions infected by its filthy slaver, and from its ashes liberty shall rise with renewed vigour for this noble province of Ascoli also."

And the Roman people, those still remaining under sacerdotal authority by the will of a Foreign Sovereign, they too have something to say adverse to the continuance of priestly rule. The "National Roman Committee" has never ceased to exist, and to manifest its existence from time to time by sundry proclamations tending to preserve and encourage a spirit of disaffection amongst the people at Rome, until such time as a fair opportunity occurs for their uprising:—

"People of Rome—An all-powerful foreign force has added another year to your slavery, another grief to the long series of your sufferings. But as a consolation you are promised some pretended administrative reforms. A partial and ephemeral application of the municipal law, promulgated at Gaeta in 1849, some changes in the postal regulations and the law of lotteries—these are the concessions which after thirteen years France has been able to extort from the Pope and the Jesuits; these alone are all the boons granted to France in return for maintaining the temporal power in Rome, against the wish of the Romans. Romans! Your gratitude is equally due to those who obtained and to those who accorded such vast benefits. 'To make war for an idea' is a magnificent expression, but to uphold by force of arms for thirteen years a Power admitted to be effete by those who support it, a Power condemned by all Europe

and cursed by those who live under it, is a fact calculated to tarnish the most splendid reputation.

“The question which has for years occupied the whole of Europe is not the consideration how it will be possible for the temporal power to exist, but how this last sad relic of the middle ages may pass away entirely. Rome, which has, of course, the chief interest in this point, can neither ask for nor receive concessions or reforms of any kind whatever. She feels that her first and predominant necessity is to belong to that nation which now claims her, and she insists on her right to proclaim this necessity; she also demands that the system of intervention should be recognised and applied in her favour; finally, she requires that a period be put to a state of affairs which is involving in utter ruin both public and private fortunes, and driving to despair thousands of families. This is what Rome has so frequently requested, through your intervention, O people of Rome! either by addresses to the King of Italy and to the Emperor of the French, or by splendid and imposing demonstrations, the importance of which has been asserted, even in the Senate of France, and by the very Ministers of the Emperor. Although your demands have not been satisfied, you must not doubt of the certainty of their being so! Whether the potentates of the earth will it or not, Italy now exists by her own force, and not by the good pleasure of others. When a nation numbers 32 millions of inhabitants having but one wish and one thought, when that nation has a brave and disciplined army, and a King called Victor Emmanuel, she need have no fear for her future destiny. The fate of Italy is in the hands of the Italians, and on their character and civil courage alone depends the question of the accomplishment of the great work of Italian unity. You, too, O Roman people, have to play a great part in this grand work. Italy expects much from your character and courage.

“Although your committee have seen clearly, by certain recent events, that neither just impatience, nor prolonged suffering can drive you to compromise your cause, still it feels it a duty to once more exhort you not to listen to those who would lead you

on to desperate acts. The country cannot be freed by culpable excesses or by unseasonable outbreaks, but only by repeated proofs of civil courage, and by constant demonstrations of your fixed desire. The hour will come when you will be called on to exhibit to Europe a spectacle worthy of Rome, and you will be equal to the occasion. Repel, then, resolutely, every suggestion of imprudent friends—repulse every attack of treacherous enemies. Tell the former that nations only become free by sacrifice and self-denial. Answer the latter by a smile of scorn and derision. What is it to you if a few hired mouths hail the “Pope King?” if a hundred employés salute the source from which they derive their living? These are the sole supporters of the temporal power, and they vainly seek to resuscitate a corpse. Be bold and prudent then, Oh Roman people; your condition is so unnatural that it is quite impossible it can long continue. You have for you Italy, her king, and the wishes of all civilised Europe. Remain confident and united, be prepared to act with firmness and courage when called on to help in the deliverance of Rome. The day when the sun of liberty shall shine on the seven hills may be delayed, but sooner or later it must dawn. Long live Italy! long live her king!

(Signed) “THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF ROME.”
Daily Telegraph, January 10, 1863.

The September Convention of 1866, between France and Italy, by which the former power agreed to withdraw her troops, and the latter her pretensions, from the Roman City, did not satisfy the Italian people. Although Florence was selected as the new centre of Government, and the cry of “Rome for the Capital” had ceased to resound within the walls of the Italian Parliament, yet the people of Italy had not forsaken their terrible resolve, best interpreted in the words of Garibaldi, “Rome or death!” Agitation commenced in the early part of 1867, and revolutionary bands were formed for the purpose of delivering Rome, and crowning the national edifice by possession of the Capital. Without the least assistance from the king’s Government, these bands, later in the year, took the field under Garibaldi; and there is no doubt but that for French intervention, the Gari-

baldians would, in the end, have overcome the Papal troops, and sacked Rome. The Roman popular view of the September Convention was embodied in a proclamation issued by the party of action, affixed to the doors of the Church of San Luigi and Dei Francesi, and distributed throughout the city, in the month of April, 1867 :—

“Romans,—The situation imposed upon Rome for the last seven years is unparalleled in history. While the whole of Italy arose to regain her nationality, by overthrowing the thrones of her tyrants, Rome was implored, for love of the nation, still to endure the tyranny of the Pope-King. While Italy declared that Rome was her capital, the Romans were still told they must continue patiently to endure the yoke of the priests. A Constitution did not suffice to secure the sovereignty of the Kings of Naples. The Council under the banner of the Holy Office was able to preserve the despots of the Vatican from fall. The Thousand of Marsala planted their flags upon the walls of Capua, but the Forty Thousand of Castelfidardo halted at Ponte Correse. A Roman general, the captain of the people, received at Caprera the grand cordon of the Annunziata for the liberation of Naples, but he was greeted with a bullet at Aspromonte for attempting to release Rome from the priests. And all this happened because between Rome and Italy, between the rights of the Romans and the crimes of priestly rule, there stood a flag of France, which fought with us in Lombardy for the freedom of Italy.

“An end was at last put to this unnatural condition by the September Convention. Thereby diplomacy acknowledged the right of the Romans to decide upon their own rulers. From that day forth they have been masters of their own destinies. They entered into possession of this right upon the 15th December, when the last Frenchman quitted Italian soil. Why did we not rise then? Why did we not show the world that nothing but force could retain us in slavery to the priests and separated from Italy? Because we Romans did not understand when boldness would have been prudence; because we did not perceive that the solution of the Roman question depended upon us alone,

and that the power of the priestcraft must gain strength with every delay.

“New situations require new systems and new men. In consideration of this we have undertaken the duty imposed upon us by our friends, and we now appeal to all our fellow-citizens who are willing to join us. Are you desirous of overthrowing the rule of the Pope, and uniting Rome to Italy as her capital? This is the only question we address to our allies. We intend to hasten the moment when Rome, while respecting in the Pope the head of the Catholic Church, casts down its temporal rule. It would be a crime to delay insurrection when its result is secure.”

“The insurrection in Rome will be supported by other simultaneous risings in the provinces, which are still governed by the priests, and where centres allied with us have already been organised. A Provisional Government will be appointed as soon as the insurrection succeeds. Its functions will be:—1. To protect order, property, right and justice. 2. To complete the national unity by joining the remainder of the States of the Church to Italy. The Provisional Government will make the fitting arrangements for this last object, will conduct the plebiscitum, and regulate the form of voting by majority.

“Romans,—In 1849, a General, clothed with authority by your Government, left Rome with part of the army. He did not capitulate. He faithfully retained his commission, and fought everywhere for Italy and for us. This General of ours, the only man we recognise as such so long as we are not Italians, still lives, and is ready to combat and die for us. His name is Joseph Garibaldi. We send this our programme to him, counting upon his assent—nay, upon his assistance. The persecution of the priests has scattered our brethren all over Italy and foreign lands. They must be united under one leader, that they may all contribute their utmost to the salvation of the country. The leadership belongs to General Garibaldi; we invite him to exercise it through men we may appoint.

“Brethren, within and outside of Rome, let us forget jealousy, strife, and suspicion; let us unite ourselves and our strength for

the overthrow of the temporal dominion. Many of us staked our lives for the freedom of Sicily from the Bourbon, and Lombardy and Venice from the Austrian. Shall it be said that the Romans fear the *sbirri* of the Pope? Let us unite. Will is strength? Let us exert our will, and the Papal realm must cease to exist, and the flag of Italy will hail Rome as the metropolis from the summit of the Seven Hills.

(Signed) "THE CENTRE OF THE INSURRECTION."

Day, April 22, 1867.

As Garibaldi takes so very prominent a part in the humiliation of the Harlot Church, I think it well to give the reader some of his most recent effusions in relation to this subject of the day. Early in 1867, just previous to the elections throughout Italy, he published his "*môt d'ordre*" headed, "Citizens, to the Poll!"—

"In Italy, the liberty which is threatened and endangered by the clerical party and its accomplices, must be assured.

"The efforts of every free man should be directed towards that supreme end.

"In your choice of members for the new Chamber you should not vote for partisans of projects suicidal to liberty, nor for satellites of fallen dynasties, supporting the Empire and the Papacy.

"The general elections may ruin or save the nation, may make of our country an arena of reaction, or a centre of progress.

"The clerical party are the subjects and soldiers of a foreign Power, of mixed and universal authority, spiritual and political, who command but do not discuss, who sow discord and corruption.

"From the obstinate enemies of our country and of civilisation, the means of injury must be removed.

"The ecclesiastical patriotism should be consecrated to the intellectual, moral, and material progress of the people, and support the public fortune.

"As our struggle with the clerical party holds in suspense the whole civilised world, our victory over it will be the re-assertion of the liberty of conscience, and the triumph of right over the prejudged.

"To the poll, then, citizens! To the poll, all!

"Your votes will show to the world of what government we are worthy, and if we deserve to be a great and free nation.

"G. GARIBALDI.

"Florence, Feb. 22, 1867."

On returning from that singular abortion, the Geneva Congress, held in September (1867), he delivered a speech to the Belgirations, on the "Lago Maggiore:"—

"Belgirations,—I thank you for this manifestation of your good-will and sympathy, of which I have need, and which is very pleasing to me. We have work to do speedily. There is that nest of vipers, the Papacy, to eradicate; there are the priests, whose craft is a huge shop, to show that the Italy of to-day is not what it has been for centuries, and that it no longer will submit to the grinding superstitions of their fraternity. We stand to-day in the face of the world, which is watching with intense interest our disposition and efforts to complete the work already begun. Let us prove ourselves worthy. Who will do honour to himself and espouse our cause, let him come to Rome. I invite no one, but the road is free to all, and I only repeat, 'Let those who will, come.' Belgirations, adieu."

After his first arrest by the Italian Government, and as soon as he set foot on the island of Caprera, in custody of the authorities, he sent to the mainland another violent proclamation, indicative of the persistence of his views:—

"To-morrow we shall have placed the seal upon our splendid revolution by the last blow levelled at the tabernacle of idolatry, of imposture, and Italian disgrace. That pedestal of all tyranny—the Papacy—has evoked the curses of the entire world, and the nations now regard Italy as a saviour. Will she be startled by the arrest of a single man into renouncing her glorious mission?"

"Acquiescing in the desire of some friends, I returned to my dwelling, free and without conditions, and upon the promise that a steamer should be sent to re-convey me to the continent. If now the man whose name is a disgrace to Italy, having recourse to police precautions, prevents me from returning to the mainland, I only ask one thing of my fellow-citizens, and that is,

constantly to march forward upon the sacred course they have traced for themselves, with the calm and the majesty of a nation conscious of its force. I have recommended discipline to the army and the people, when both, indignant at the timid servility of the authorities, demanded to be led on to Rome. I have told the soldiers that their bayonets should be reserved for a more glorious mission, and that the butts of their rifles would suffice to expel the mercenaries of the Pope.

“Despite the genius of evil which still weighs down our country, there exists one fact consolatory to us all—the brotherly agreement of the strong and formidable elements of the nation, the army, the people, and the volunteers.

“Woe to him who shall hurl the apple of discord in the midst of his brethren. When Italy shall be able to count upon her sons thronging the ranks in one redeeming company, the detached handful will hide their heads, and futile apprehensions of foreign intervention will be at an end.

“I repeat, therefore, you must achieve the redemption of Rome by every possible means; but if you think that my assistance is necessary, I reckon upon you to think upon my deliverance.

“GARIBALDI.”

Austria, bigoted Austria, has even turned round at last upon the “Harlot,” and repudiates the Concordat, that ill-judged alliance which almost mortally injured the Empire. Several Bishops of the Roman Church, alarmed at the progress of Liberalism throughout Austria, took upon themselves the responsibility of petitioning the Emperor, in a sense adverse to the progress of the so-called Liberal ideas. But their day of triumph over the conscience of a virtuous Prince is gone, and he replies to their retrogressive sentiments, chiding them as disturbers of the peace, in the following strain:—

“Dear Cardinal Prince-Archbishop Rauscher,—I have con- signed the address directed to me, and forwarded to my Court residence at Ischl by the archbishops and bishops whom you caused to assemble together in conference at Vienna on the last days of September, to my responsible ministry. I appreciate willingly the pastoral eagerness and the well-meaning intentions

which may have made it appear to the assembled bishops that it was their conscientious duty to stand up afresh, with a solemn declaration, for the guarantee of the rights and interests of the Catholic Church, as they did in the years 1849 and 1861; but I deplore that they, instead of assisting my Government in its earnest endeavours to solve urgent and weighty questions, and of contributing to the prompt solution of those questions in a spirit of reconciliation and concession, as I should have wished them to do, have taken upon themselves, through the publication of an address calculated to deeply agitate the passions, to aggravate the difficulties of that task at an epoch in which, as the bishops themselves appositely remark, unity is so paramountly needful to us, and when it is urgently demanded that the incitements to division and recrimination should not be augmented. I trust that the worthy archbishops and bishops hold themselves assured that I at all times know how to shield and protect the Church, but that they will also keep in mind the duties that I have to fulfil as *constitutional sovereign*.

“Vienna, October 15, 1867.” (Signed) “FRANZ JOSEPH.

Troubles beset the Papacy, as it would seem, from every quarter, since even Russia has recently had a bitter quarrel with that Church concerning Poland. The Papacy has ever been a vile fomentor of rebellion, wherever the sovereign power of States has not been in alliance with her creed. It would be impossible for any consistent and energetic Government to tolerate the meddling propensities of the Papacy. “To tolerate Rome,” said Locke, “is to tolerate intolerance,” so persistently will this Church ever continue to *force* her theology on the people of the earth—so unchangeable is she in her resolve to do evil that an imagined good may come. The *Moskooskia Vaidomosti*, a Russian newspaper, gave its readers the following narrative of this quarrel:—

“Up to the present time the Russian Government has met the sallies of the Papal Court with dignified silence; but now that a series of documents has been published with the view of casting upon this country the responsibility of breaking off the relations with Rome, and of cancelling the concordat, the Imperial Cabinet has considered it necessary, without entering into any

controversy, to publish the history of its relations with the Papal Government, and to re-establish the truth which the latter had misrepresented. On reading over this account, we are less surprised that the rupture should have occurred, than that it did not happen sooner. The greater the patience shown by the Imperial Government, the more evident was the impossibility of an agreement in the spirit of concession. Nothing in contemporary history bears the slightest analogy to that strange anomaly, the relic of a bygone age, a sovereign pontiff at the head of an ecclesiastical Government. Being both priest and sovereign, the Pope claims the privileges attached to both dignities, but refuses to take upon himself the obligations of either. When he has to act as a sovereign, the high priest falls back upon his humility and his defenceless state, and on the Kingdom of Heaven; when he has to act as a hierarch, the monarch threatens, thunders, and commands. He is a priest when he should be a king, and a king when he should be a priest. He wants foreign soldiers to secure the obedience of his own subjects, but he keeps an army in foreign states. He begs like a mendicant, and exacts like a conqueror. His military power is useless for warfare, but it is enough to disturb the domestic peace of foreign states, and to sow dissension amongst nations. That concession to Rome leads to no good result is a truth confirmed by the history of our relations with the Papal chair. Religious freedom is a great principle, but yielding to the pretensions of Rome is not upholding liberty, but encouraging a spirit of intolerance. Freedom has nothing to gain from concession to Rome, and even those who profess the Catholic faith would be benefited if a limit were put to the Papal claims. . . . Even in those countries where Catholicism prevails, the ruling powers endeavour to restrict them in order to prevent religion from being mixed up with politics. The country is tranquil, the people active, and civilisation is regularly developed in a Catholic state where the pretensions of the Papacy are opposed; it is, indeed, only in such countries that Catholicism assumes the character of a real Christian Church.

“In the history of the relations of the Russian Government

with the Holy See, the negotiations for receiving a nuncio in Russia are particularly interesting, from their details being entirely new to the public, and from their being so very characteristic. The Imperial Cabinet itself proposed that a permanent embassy should be established at St. Petersburg. What more could the Pope wish from an orthodox power? But while a friendly correspondence was being carried on between the two Governments, and when the Pope, as a proof of his good feeling towards Russia, expressed his disapprobation of the acts of the Polish clergy, his Holiness, by a secret communication, showed his sympathy for the Poles, and encouraged the clergy in those very acts with which he had expressed himself dissatisfied. When this was discovered, and the Papal Government was questioned on the subject, Cardinal Antonelli said in his justification that his Holiness was obliged to act in this manner to avoid being thought indifferent to the interests of the Church; that this was not a brief, strictly speaking, but only a letter from the Pope in the Latin language, and not on parchment but on simple paper; and that it had been sent from the office of the Latin secretary, and not from the chancery of Papal briefs.

“ But the peculiarity of these characteristic circumstances does not consist so much in the casuistry and duplicity displayed, as in the fact that the Papal Government, when within view of so important a concession, should have made such demands as rendered it impossible. They pretended to make a favour of accepting the proposed concession, and at the same time claimed for the nuncios at St. Petersburg, rights and privileges which Papal nuncios never enjoy even in Catholic countries. The arrangement was not concluded because the Roman Government answered with the usual *non possumus* to all the efforts, to persuade them that the nuncio in Russia should be subjected to the same limitations which were considered necessary in Catholic France. The freedom of action which the Russian Government has regained by the rupture of the relations with Rome, and the nullification of the concordat, will, it is hoped, be beneficial to that portion of the population professing the Roman Catholic religion

in Russia. The tolerance of our legislation is unchanged. There will be no interference with religious faith nor religious ceremonies, but the Government has no obligation towards a foreign power."—Translated in *Standard*, February 5th, 1867.

Great Britain has really taken no part in this utter desolation of the Papacy; yet it may be well to put on record a few observations which evidence the general opinions prevailing throughout the country. Some ideas were expressed in the British House of Lords, in 1861, quite confirmatory of the actual state of things. Lord Wodehouse took occasion to say, in the course of a debate on 19th April, in that House:—"Since the year 1849 the independence of the Pope, as a Sovereign, has not existed for a single hour. His authority, which had been destroyed by that movement in 1848, the full effects of which we are feeling at the present day, was only restored by the troops of France and Austria. As long as those troops remained in his territory, the sovereignty of the Pope was nominally sustained; but on the day on which the Austrian troops left the territory which they occupied, it ceased to be under even the nominal authority of the Pope, and it is notorious that on the day on which the French troops shall be withdrawn from Rome the sovereignty of the Pope will altogether cease in every part of his dominions."—*Times*, April 20, 1861.

The Earl of Clarendon, on the same occasion, remarked concerning the Pope, that "He has delegated his power to other authorities, one in the capital and another in the provinces, who exercise it for him. There cannot be the slightest doubt of what my noble friend the Under Secretary has said, that the moment that the pressure of foreign forces is withdrawn the nullity of the Pope's power will become manifest. Nothing can be more certain than that the day when the French army quits Rome the Pope's subjects will throw off their allegiance."—*Times*, April 20, 1861.

And our press has given utterings, from time to time, of views pretty largely shared by the community in general:—

"Philosophy and civilization have paralysed the power of Rome, and left the sacerdotal tyrant to bewail the shamelessness and effrontery with which he has demanded for his vices the reverence of innumerable nations.

“We are now witnessing, at least in part, that for which thousands of great and honest men have longed in vain—the unveiling of the mystery of iniquity, and the exposure of its originators to shame. Still throughout Europe the effects are visible of that benightment which the Popes accomplished in the days of their power. Clever and ingenious men, bishops, doctors, professors, with classical learning and logic at their command, still condescend, even here in England, to construct syllogisms in favour of the Roman impostor. Cardinal Wiseman carried on the craft so long as his intrepidity and the subscriptions of his dupes would hold out; and he has bequeathed his tattered mantle to Dr. Newman, who, like a worshipper of Mumbo Jumbo, repeats the formulas of his sorceries to a mocking and incredulous age. But Popery is at its last gasp.”
—*Daily Telegraph*.

“The spectacle of superannuated infallibility muttering toothless censures against its most enlightened children, must be a sore trial to the faith and patience of even the most devoted adherents of the Holy See who live beyond the enervating precincts of the Vatican, whilst among unbelievers it is but too likely to provoke contemptuous compassion, if not profane scorn. Yet this is the attitude in which the Pope comes forward in his letter to the Archbishop of Munich, relating to the Congress of learned Roman Catholics recently held in that city.”—*Daily News*, 23rd March, 1864.

“The *Spectator* notices another and a terrible blow which has this week fallen upon the Papacy, a blow which will affect its authority more directly than the series of reverses which have followed the great defeat at Sadowa. Since that battle Venetia has been liberated, and the last hope of regaining power in Italy finally swept away. The Polish Church has been virtually released from Papal authority, the clerical party has been utterly overthrown in Mexico, Church property has been sequestered throughout Italy, and Ultramontanism has been expelled from the kingdom of Hungary. The Concordat which had been octroyed there while the Hapsburgs were absolute required the sanction of the Diet, and with the

revival of constitutional life it silently disappeared. In less than twelve months the Papacy has lost the control of three great kingdoms, a province nearly as large as a kingdom, and property which in Italy, Mexico, and Poland must be worth at the very least £100,000,000 sterling, and might twenty years hence have been valued at thrice that sum. It is a frightful list of misfortunes, yet it is doubted whether the whole together will be so bitterly felt in Rome as the decision of the 26th of July, when the Austrian Reichsrath, by a vote of 130 to 24, solemnly decreed that the Concordat should cease to exist. A great and stately kingdom, within which there is no spiritual dissent and can therefore be no spiritual harshness; in which the Church, being invested with all rights, can show herself careless of all privileges; in which bishops, receiving abundantly both of respect and cash, need exact nothing—this is the true Roman ideal, and it is fast passing beyond hope. With the Lutherans rising daily higher, Spanish America fallen or falling away, whole Catholic races asserting the right of private judgment upon sacraments, a Mussulman sovereign received by all Europe, an indifferentist republic growing steadily into a terror to the world, Italian troops steadily drawing in towards St. Peter's itself, where half the bishops of Christendom in conclave are declaring the Papacy divine, the Vatican must perceive that it is gazing into a somewhat hopeless world."—*Pall Mall Gazette*, August 3rd, 1867.

This Section of my subject—"Doom of the False Church"—was really written, and intended for publication, early in the year, and long before the recent *fiasco* of Garibaldi and his impatient revolutionists against the remaining territory of Rome, had once again brought French troops for the support of the Pope, *apparently* deferring for a long period that expected end, which was thought so near. If, however, my judgment be correct, this affair of "a few weeks" is likely to be instrumental in hastening, rather than deferring, the total eclipse of the Pope's temporal power. The Emperor of France, as many think, wishes to avoid the direct and open responsibility of destroying the Church—wishes, indeed, for the Church "to

destroy herself." Hence his apparent inconsistency towards the principles which he personifies.

In spite of the bravery of the Papal Zouaves, and the presence of the French army, it is quite clear the Pope is in no way tranquilised by the turn events have taken. The following Encyclical, indeed, betrays his fears:—"They walk in impiety; they serve under the banner of Satan, upon whose front is written 'Lies;' and, turning their mouths to Heaven, they blaspheme God, soil and despise all that is sacred, and treading under foot all Divine and human laws, breathe out carnage like rapacious wolves, losing their souls by their great sins, carrying away by violence the goods of others, afflicting the feeble and poor, increasing the number of unhappy widows and orphans, and in the corruptions of their hearts shamefully satiating themselves with bad passions to the great injury of society itself. It is by this race of lost men that we are now surrounded, venerable brethren. Actuated by a spirit altogether diabolic, these men desire to unfold the standard of lies even in our beloved city, near the chair of St. Peter, the centre of truth and Catholic unity. And the chiefs of the Piedmontese Government, who ought to repress such men, do not blush to support them with all their zeal, to give them arms and all necessaries, and to pave for them the way to the city. But let them tremble, although placed at the supreme head of a civil power, for by this perverse conduct they come under the weight of ecclesiastical chastisement and censures. And though in the humility of our heart we do not cease to pray, and with all our might supplicate God, rich in mercy, that He may bring these unfortunate men to a salutary penitence, and into the right path of justice, religion, and piety, we cannot be silent on the grave dangers to which we are exposed in this dark hour."—*Evening Star*, Nov. 1, 1867.

Cardinal Cullen makes no secret of his utter distrust of the Emperor, in spite of the latest French intervention:—

"Now, how is the Pope to meet all his difficulties? Can he turn to the Catholic governments and ask them for aid and protection? It is to be feared that he has very little to expect in such quarters, even though many of those in power

entertain the kindest feelings towards his Holiness. For what is the state of things? The kingdom of Italy is in inextricable difficulties, its subjects are overwhelmed with taxes, the property of the Church is confiscated, and its bishops and priests and religious orders are suffering the direst persecution. In such circumstances the Government, even were it as friendly as it is hostile, were it as Catholic as it is infidel, could do nothing. Belgium and Portugal are ruled by Freemasons, always opposed to the Holy See. In Spain the Queen and her friends are animated with a noble Catholic spirit; but their energies are paralysed by revolutionary movements encouraged from without.

“As to Austria she has been weakened by late defeats, and, what is worse, her government appears to be drifting into the hands of infidels and secret societies, which have lately given proof of their hostility to the Church, by the answer which they have published in the Emperor’s name to the petition of the Catholic bishops, that the concordat most solemnly entered into a very few years ago with the Holy See should be observed. Let us hope that the Emperor will not be deceived by the professions of false friends. An alliance with the enemies of the rights of the Church was very lately the occasion of the loss of Crown and life to one member of the Imperial house of Hapsburg. It is to be feared that the infidels and pseudo-Liberals in Austria may not be more faithful to their noble-minded and generous Emperor than their brethren were in Mexico to the ill-fated Maximilian, so basely betrayed and butchered by pretended friends of liberty. Happy for him that before he met his sad doom he retracted the alliance referred to, and, in an autograph letter to the Pope, expressed his regret for the mistakes he had made.

“*As to France, though its rulers have done many good things for religion, yet we cannot put much confidence in their proceedings where the Head of the Church is concerned.* In 1860, notwithstanding repeated promises of assistance and protection, they allowed the Sardinians to seize on all that was valuable in the Pope’s dominions, and they looked on with folded arms and cold indifference while Cialdini, with a most numerous army, was

butchering the few but gallant troops of the immortal Lamoriciere, though one word from France would have been sufficient to prevent so sad a disaster."—Letter to the Clergy and Laity of his diocese, *Standard*, October 31, 1867.

And in a speech delivered at Dublin, on 17th November, again notified this want of confidence. "He was of opinion, that they should not put too much trust in the sincerity of French rulers."—*Daily Telegraph*, November 18, 1867.

Whilst the opposite party—those who are supposed to be represented by the Napoleonic principles—are altogether indisposed to let their prey escape:—

"A deputation of working men of Paris have sent in the draught of a petition to the office of the *Siècle* newspaper, to which they invite signatures. It runs thus:—'Since 1789 democracy has demanded from the world freedom of conscience and the separation of Church and State. To-day the reactionists are making a desperate effort to engage France in a fatal intervention which would be at once a violation of liberty against the Romans, and would precipitate our country into a European war for the defence of a principle which we repudiate. As sons of the French Revolution, our duty is to protest energetically against all intervention for the protection of the Pope-King.'—*Express*, Oct. 25, 1867.

The correspondent of the *Morning Star*, writing from Paris early in November, asks, in words of great consistency—

"Can France, a great, generous, and noble nation, so far forget herself as to be hurried into a crime of this nature against a people whom she was lately proud to claim as allies, and for a principle which she herself stamped as antiquated and effete by her Revolution of 1789? Can the Emperor, casting aside the prudence of his earlier years, and embracing the principles against which his reign has been a protest, hurry on to consummate in Italian blood his submission to a priesthood who regard him as an Iscariot, and who boast of their allegiance to the Bourbons? The prospect appears so incredible that we are almost tempted to accept the solution which some of the clerical papers themselves expect—that when the curtain rises for the

last act, it will be to show us the Italian army entering Rome amid the rapturous welcome of the people. It may be so, but the public mind everywhere is filled with dismal forebodings of a catastrophe."

The summary of all this evidence respecting the destruction and the destroyer of the Papacy, is simple. If my propositions be true—that the Papacy is the "SCARLET LADY" of the Apocalypse, and the individual who assumes, or to whom belongs, the chief responsibility of her destruction, is the ANTI-CHRIST—propositions for which there is the most ample warrant of Scripture, then it follows, that Papal Rome is about to receive a violent dismissal from her place in the affections of nations long subservient to her will, and the Emperor Louis Napoleon is that historical personage, denominated "the Man of Sin," and "the Lawless One," by the apostle Paul, also the Eighth polity or head of the Roman Empire (crowned democracy) foreseen by St. John. There *is* nothing, there *need be* nothing, out of the common course of history, to fulfil all the prophetic predictions of God's Word. Those who look for supernatural marvels will very likely be taken by surprise when the day of the Lord suddenly dawns. But they, on the contrary, who watch the currents of history, and mark the signs of the times (passing events) noted on the prophetic dial, will see clearly, and be almost daily looking for the morning. They will discover in the modern Infidel principles so prevalent, that apostacy from Christianity which St. Paul wrote should immediately precede the Second Advent of Christ; and they cannot fail to observe that these dark principles have their representative Sovereign, as was also particularised by the apostle. They will note that the Harlot Church of Rome feels keenly the onslaught of Liberalism, and that she attributes her destruction and decay to the "principles and person" of the great Apostacy. They will eagerly watch for the appearing of the Lord Jesus, not slothfully, not forsaking their duties, nor neglecting their responsibilities, knowing that the Master frowns on inactivity, and in reference to each man's occupation of the trust committed to him, has Himself said, "Blessed is that servant whom His Lord when He cometh shall find so doing!"

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

IF there is any truth or reality in Prophecy—and who dare question it?—if the historical fulfilment of those Prophecies relating to the Harlot Church of the seven hilled city, set forth in this work, are clear and explicit—and who can controvert such remarkable evidences?—then there is nothing left for me to do, but to take up the loud and solemn cry of the winged messenger in the xviii. chapter of the Apocalypse: “Come out of *her*, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and receive not of her plagues.”

Popery, encouraged by the latitudinarian and liberalising spirit of the age, has been making some considerable advances of late in the United Kingdom, and large numbers of Christians, belonging to various Protestant denominations, have become seriously alarmed, lest a complete subversion of the Protestant faith should result therefrom. I never shared such fears, for prophecy, and that history which so remarkably fulfils its wonderful predictions, make it unmistakeably plain that the false Church is to be destroyed by the gross apostacy, which exalts itself above all that is called *God*, and against all worship. It was an Apostate *Pagan* power that destroyed the Harlot Church of the Jews, and, as we have seen, it is to be an Apostate and *infidel* power which is to destroy the Harlot Church of the Gentiles. Englishmen take too narrow a view of the subject, when they contemplate the fancied triumphs of Papal Rome in Britain, without casting a glance at the position of that Church on the Continent of Europe. *There* we behold her glory departing, her priests despised, her doctrines rejected, her territories despoiled, her authority denied, her infallibility mocked. *Here* we witness what seems to be an awakening out of sleep, a redoubling of her efforts, a multiplication of her converts, a lengthening of her

cords, and a strengthening of her stakes, and men marvel and fear. The position of Great Britain in its relations to the Papacy appears anomalous, and yet this is easily explained; and that which strikes so many with amazement, is but the very natural result of the establishment of a God-denying Liberalism in the land. Under the shadow of that Apostate scheme, all religions, of whatever type, find a certain repose and protection; because the State policy of democracy is to decry the influence of religion, and to proclaim an universal equality, in order to neutralize the powerful restraints of a virtuous Christianity. This is the cause of Papal lamentation in Italy, Spain, France, and other countries of Europe. This is that Liberalism against which the Pope and his Cardinals have so frequently, and yet so vainly, protested.* And this is the precise cause of Papal progress in England, as well as of the great development of schism amongst our Protestant sects. Every religion thrives, after a fashion, under the loose and disorderly legislation of liberalism. Judaism would increase, if the Jews were a proselytising instead of an exclusive people; and knowing the violence of the Church of Rome, her deep-seated enmity towards this country for the long-continued protest Great Britain has made against the gross iniquities of her system, we need not marvel that such an opportunity as is afforded by the prevalence of liberalism and democracy, should be so readily and assiduously seized by that Church, which has *made* all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.

But have we really anything to fear from Popery? To serve their dark and unholy purpose, Liberals are willing to encourage the false religion of Rome.† They court her friendship, they ally themselves with her representatives, they bribe her with substantial attentions, and use her aid to crush the wholesome and truthful Protestantism of the Parliament and Nation. But can there be any permanent association between such opposites—between the extreme of divine-right theocracy, and the extreme of popular-right infidelity? Such an amalgamation could only be effected by a compromise, and the Church of Rome never

* See "ANOMIA," pp. 52—55.

† "ANOMIA," pp. 63, 64.

compromises; whilst Liberalism, hitherto, has shown no moderation, and if it be the last apostacy, will not. On the principle that extremes meet, Liberalism might, if the world were to last sufficiently long, rush into the bosom of so perfect an organisation as the Church of Rome, to escape from the anarchy of its own lawlessness.

Either way, the Nation has more to fear from Liberalism than from Popery, and the former is the true source of all the religious mischief which is going on around us. It is Liberalism which encourages Popery. It is Liberalism which tolerates the secret incarceration of people in Papal nunneries; at the same time it insists upon publicly superintending all Protestant institutions. It is Liberalism which denies to the faithful Orange party of Ireland the privilege of displaying its colours and ensigns, whilst Popery is allowed to flaunt her mummeries proudly in the sight of society; or, in other words, Liberalism winks at the disobedience of the Papists to the laws concerning party processions, whilst it refuses to tolerate any infringement of the same Act by Orangemen. It is Liberalism which makes men infidel, and thus prepares them the more certainly and effectually to be duped by Popery. So that whilst inviting the Lord's people to leave the pale of the Harlot Church of Rome, I would equally urge upon all intelligent Christian men and women to strive with their utmost strength to save Britain, if possible, from the malignant Apostacy, now so alarming and so threatening. We may have toleration, true and kindly, without national indifference; we can preserve a national Church and a national faith, without persecuting those who may choose to worship after another fashion, even though it be through the liturgy of an anti-national system.

The eclipse of the Harlot Church of Rome marks a most important era. It is one of those buddings of the prophetic fig-tree which prove that summer is nigh. Carried away by the floods of that apostacy which St. Paul predicted must *first* come, and betrayed by "the Lawless One," who is himself to fade away at the approach of the King of Kings; we are privileged to know that this marvellous disappearance of the Woman but precedes the appearance of the long-expected Messiah.

Christian reader—ah, and worldly reader, too!—open your Bibles, and peruse the few concluding chapters of St. John's Revelation. There is very little to happen after Mystic Babylon's destruction. The identical power which subdues the Woman on the seven hills, is itself destroyed by the Lord from heaven. I dare not be too presumptuous. I must, in all humility, admit the *possibility* of my prophetic deductions proving incorrect, although I cannot think it probable. The interpretation of Prophecy by history has all along been so clear, and so literal, that I have not yet had to recal anything. Venturing prayerfully and cautiously, I seem not to have missed my way. I have never intruded personal views; never allowed any motive to influence my researches but a love of the truth; and God forbid that I should ever be the subject of a delusion myself, or the instrument of a delusion to others! I do not share the too-common opinion that Prophecy is difficult, dangerous, uncertain. I cannot so misinterpret the intention of God in revealing to His people the events of the future. I dare not sanction the neglect of that study upon which Jesus has so emphatically pronounced His blessing. I admit, with great sorrow, that the subject has been wrongly treated by some, and wickedly abused by others; on which account I am the more anxious to rescue it from that dangerous oblivion into which it was fast sinking in the minds of many of the Lord's faithful people. I hope, with God's blessing, to continue my labours in this direction, and trust I may be the weak instrument of His will for dissipating the human mists which have so long obscured one of the most powerful evidences of Christianity, and deprived the Church of one of its most glorious consolations. It must be a work of time and patience, since I have only spare moments to devote to it, and the Church, moreover, is not sufficiently alive to its importance to desire an abundant supply. Again, it is difficult to reach the Christian public—to persuade them that in place of a confused and presumptuous *Prophecy*, you have to offer them a simple and straightforward development of history in accordance with God's *foreknowledge*. To get a work reviewed is so much a matter of favour or accident, that this means of awakening attention is

practically closed to those who hardly consider it right to extort other than a disinterested notice. Advertising is expensive, and must be almost sensational to produce effect. There only remains one chance—that those who read approvingly, and can do so conscientiously, should recommend the works they thus sanction to the consideration of others.

I cannot do better than conclude my inquiry into the existence and doom of the Mystical Babylon, than by saying, that if all these things be so, “What manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God?” (2 Peter iii., 11.)

[NOTE.—I take this opportunity of saying, that if any reader of my works labours under difficulty, discovers any contradictions, or needs any question answered, and will forward such queries or suggestions on a slip of paper to the publisher, I will endeavour in my next book to supply answers and explanations to the best of my ability.]

By the same Author.

ANOMIA;
OR,
LIBERALISM AND ITS NAPOLEONIC MESSIAH.

COMPRISING

Facts from Cotemporaneous History in identification of
THE PRINCIPLES, PERSON, AND KINGDOM OF
"ANTICHRIST."

Svo., Cloth. Price 3s. 6d.

"It is no small commendation of a book to be able to affirm of it, that apart from the primary object which its author has in view, it is seasonable, useful, and instructive.] [Each and all will find in this work an array of evidence, alike sober, unimpeachable, and incontrovertible, as to the character of the times in which we live, proving to demonstration—not that they *may* be, but that they *are*, the last perilous times foretold by the Apostle."

"RAINBOW," Oct. 1, 1866.

ALSO,

THE SPEAKING IMAGE;
OR,
NAPOLEONISM PROPHETICALLY UNVEILED.

Price 1s. 6d.

"It is one of the most striking publications that has been issued from the press for some time. I am exceedingly indebted to the author, who is, however, unknown to me, for the masterly manner in which he has brought together circumstantial evidence relating to this great subject; and I also owe a debt of gratitude to him for the graphic manner in which he has called the attention of the professing Church to the crisis which is at hand."

"THE ENIGMA," by PAUL FOSKETT.

ALSO,

WHO AND WHAT IS ANTICHRIST?
(A series of remarkable Parallels.)

Price 6d.

LONDON :

W. MACINTOSH, 24, PATERNOSTER ROW.

In course of preparation by the same Author.

רְהִמָּה

OR,

ISRAEL'S NATIONAL RESURRECTION.

COMPRISING

Facts from Cotemporaneous History, in attestation of

THE NEARNESS AND CERTAINTY OF THE RETURN OF
GOD'S ANCIENT PEOPLE TO PALESTINE.

ALSO,

REST WITH US;

OR,

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN AT HAND.

COMPRISING

A Biblical Analysis

OF

THE TRUE MILLENIAL REIGN OF CHRIST,

WHICH SHALL SUPERSEDE THE

MOCK-MILLENIAL TRIUMPH OF ANTICHRIST.



