



### **An Appeal to Bible Students by Rev. E. P. Cachemaille**

At the present time the most important matter in the interpretation of the prophetic visions is the identification of the Antichrist. Is he amongst us now; and if so, who is he?

The Martyrs, the Reformers, and the Historicists generally, down to the present day, guided by the visions from Dan. vii. to Rev. xix., have no doubts on the matter: The Papacy, that is the succession of the Popes, is the Antichrist foretold and described in Scripture. Many precious and holy lives have been given up in attestation of this belief; and if the historical explanation of these visions be

honestly and continuously followed all along, and compared with the facts of history, it seems impossible to believe otherwise.

A truth so damaging to the great power that claimed to represent Christ on earth had to be nullified somehow, and towards the end of the sixteenth century the Jesuit Ribera put forth his counter-scheme, the main point of which was that in the visions of Revelation all from the Sixth Seal onwards belong to the time of the end, when an Antichrist shall appear and have a brief career. This scheme, if true, would have rehabilitated the Papacy, by relegating the appearance of an Antichrist to a far distant future, not yet reached even now. How Ribera explained Dan. vii. 8-11, 20-26, does not appear, but in this connection those passages cannot be ignored.

Now these two schemes—beyond all question decisively antagonistic to each other and impossible of reconciliation—are before us at the present time, and have a multitude of supporters, learned and unlearned; and the momentous question has to be faced and answered by the individual Bible student: Which of these two ought I to follow? Shall I ignore the witness of all those learned expositors, and especially of that noble army of martyrs, who were willing to suffer even to death for what they had learnt through the Spirit from God's Word? And shall I instead adopt the teaching of the defender of their murderer, of the slayer of the witnesses of Christ? Surely we must reply, God forbid !

The Historicists, no less than the Futurists, look for a personal Antichrist at the last; it could not be otherwise. If the critical period at the end be short, he who fills it cannot be other than a person; there is no room for a succession. But here is the grand difference. The Historicist Antichrist of the end is the last member or members of a succession that has lasted for more than twelve centuries; whereas the Futurist Antichrist is an imaginary person, hitherto unknown, who appears at short notice quite at the end, and runs a career of only three and a half years' duration.

The identification of the Antichrist, then, is the matter of supreme moment, as Ribera well knew. It must not be treated as a side-issue; it will powerfully affect us nationally and not only religiously. Explanations of the Apocalyptic visions by those who follow Ribera's lead are of comparatively little importance. As these explanations are supposed to relate to the still future, they are not tied down by any of the facts of history, and imagination can have full play. However devout and spiritually profitable some of them may be, the test question is—Where do they place the Antichrist? If at the far end, they are consciously or unconsciously following the lead of the Jesuit, and are ignoring the teaching of centuries of European history and of a great cloud of witnesses.

I earnestly appeal, not only to lay Bible readers, but especially to my clerical brethren, to look dispassionately into this great business, not as mere partisans of a system, but as sober-minded, scholarly students searching for the truth. They ought to have definite views on a subject of such paramount importance, a subject too that is so wonderfully clearing up in our day.

The following text-books perhaps embody all that is best on this subject, but unfortunately all are now out of print and can only be obtained occasionally on the second-hand market: *The Approaching End of the Age and Light for the Last Days*, both by Dr. Grattan Guinness; *The Visions of Daniel and of the Revelation explained on the Continuous Historic System*; *The Prophetic Outlook To-day*; [\*Antichrist and his Ten Kingdoms\*](#), by Albert Close.

# THE **ANTICHRIST**

## HIS PORTRAIT AND HISTORY

By  
BARON PORCELLI

---

FIRST AMERICAN  
.. EDITION ..

---

### **ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

Baron Alfred Porcelli, R. E., was born in Palermo, Italy, his father being Colonel Baron A. S. R. Porcelli di S. Andrea, supporter of Garibaldi, the Italian liberator. His mother was a Scottish lady; and, as a young man, Baron Porcelli became a naturalized British subject, and served Queen Victoria in the Royal Engineers. He died at Hove, November 4th, 1937, at the advanced age of eighty-eight years.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

Owing to high cost of printing in England, the Protestant Truth Society, of London, has given up the publication of Porcelli's "ANTICHRIST." This, according to a letter to us dated April 14, 1971, from A. L. Kensit, Secretary.

As a consequence, and because of the increasing interest of the book, in U.S. A., Canada, and other parts, the undersigned proposes, by God's help, to continue this as a distinct service to Christ's Church and witness to the unbelieving world.

Oid Fashioned Prophecy Magazine  
Blackwood, N. J., U.S. A.

### **PREFACE**

THE Author, in compiling this essay, has rigidly eschewed flights of fancy and theories, and has sought to place before the Christian reader facts, which require only to be duly weighed and compared with the prophetic Scriptures in order to produce conviction.

The condition of Christendom to-day is such as to cause serious alarm and distress to thoughtful minds, owing to the multiplicity of “isms,” which very often read plausibly, but, *au fond*, (at its heart) are sadly erroneous, owing to lack of care in observation and study; and, not less often, owing to hasty acceptance of theories which have no basis in truth. “To the Law and the Testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no Light in them.” – Isaiah 8:20.

May He, Who is Light, graciously grant light to all who peruse what is herein written, after a generation of careful study in many lands, and in many books. Britain’s danger to-day is extreme, chiefly because of non-recognition of her great enemy.

ALFRED PORCELLI.

Revised 1927, 1929, and 1948.

### **THE ANTICHRIST: His PORTRAIT AND HISTORY. BARON PORCELLI.**

The prevailing cry in these days is for “fundamentals,” not fancies or theories, and there are many writers who deserve special commendation in their endeavors to cope with that demand. Baron Porcelli, in his book on “The Antichrist” has strenuously set himself out to provide us with facts, which, according to him, “require only to be duly weighed and compared with the prophetic Scriptures in order to produce conviction.” He deplores the multiplicity of “isms,” which lead to a hasty acceptance of theories which have no basis in truth. The author’s first point is to make clear the real meaning of the term “Antichrist,” and he puts forth arguments which the conscientious student cannot afford to ignore. The important points to note about the book, however, are:— It is written from the standpoint of the historical school of interpretation; is frankly anti-papal; and it gives supreme honour to the Bible. The book is interesting in these perplexing times, which, again to quote the author’s own words, “cause serious alarm and distress to thoughtful minds.”

## **THE ANTICHRIST**

### **HIS PORTRAIT AND HISTORY**

---

#### **CHAPTER I.**

##### **MEANING OF THE TERM.**

In order to ascertain the nature of “The Antichrist,” it is essential to be cautious in our dealings with Scripture phraseology, and to remember that, whereas we are accustomed to Western modes of thought, the Bible writers were not so. They were all Orientals, and the languages employed by them—viz., Hebrew and Greek— did not, and still do not, lend themselves completely to modern Western terminology.

The very word “Antichrist” is a manufactured one, unknown to Hebrew usage, and has no corresponding equivalent in the Anglo- Saxon dialect. It is wrong, therefore, to jump to the conclusion that the mere sound of the word denotes its meaning. That is by no means the case. The true sense has to be discovered by careful study of (a) the context in which it is used; (B) the parallel passages —if any—in corresponding predictions; (c) similar Oriental terms in classical and Biblical writings,

## A.—The Context.

Now, the word “Antichrist” occurs only in the Epistles of John, and, as there used by him, is applied to many persons existing in the first century. It is not confined to one particular individual, still to appear in subsequent days—“It is the last time, and as ye have heard that the Antichrist (Ho Antichristos) cometh (erchetai), even now many Antichrists . . . went out from us... Who is a liar but he that denieth, that Jesus is the Christ? He is the Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son.” – 1 John 2:18-22 “Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come (eleeluthota, already come) in the flesh, is not of God; and this is that spirit of the Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already it is in the world.”-1 John 4:3

“Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is coming (erchomenon, still to come) in the flesh, This is a deceiver and an Antichrist.” – 2 John 7

Observe the difference in the tenses, “is come” and “is coming,” and the description of “the Antichrist” as a “liar” and “deceiver.” The spirit of Antichrist was already in the world in apostolic days. It is therefore wrong and mistaken to look for, or to suspect, some fresh spirit, some *fin de siecle* (French term meaning “end of century”) manifestation, and to dub *that* “The Antichrist.” We tread on safer ground when we combine John’s words, and read them thus: “The spirit of Antichrist ‘denies’ the true humanity of Jesus Christ, for it confesses not that He is come already in the flesh, and is coming again in the flesh. So doing, men are liars and deceivers and Antichrists. There were many such in John’s days.”

The context, moreover, does not support the idea either of one unique personality to appear in the “last days,” or of a blatant Atheist. On the contrary, John says of the Antichrists of his day: “They went out from us”—that is, they were Christian apostates, who held false views of our Lord’s humanity. These false views are explained by John: “Whosoever goes onward, and abides not in the teaching of Christ, has not God. He that abides in the teaching of Christ has both the Father and the Son. 2 John 9 To go beyond the limits of Christ’s teaching in regard to Himself is a denial of God, whereas to abide by it is to possess the Father and Son. As Christ repeatedly taught that He is “Son of Man,” as well as “Son of God,” and that, as “Son of Man,” He will once again revisit this earth, *in propria persona*, (in one’s own person, Matt, xxv. 13, xx. 18, xvi. 27; John iii. 13, vi. 62, v. 25.) any man who propounds views opposed to the obvious meaning of that teaching is a liar, a deceiver and an Antichrist. Compare the teaching in Canons I., II., VI., Session XIII, and Canons I., II., Session XXII., Council of Trent.

Now, the obvious meaning of that teaching is that Jesus Christ was a real man of proper humanity, who really died, really rose again, really ascended to Heaven, and will really return from Heaven in his Human body of glorified, but real, flesh. He who “denies,” or does not “confess,” by his teaching, this essential truth,” (1 John ii. 22.) “denies” the Father and the Son—in the sense of the word “deny” in Scripture, of course: “But ye denied the Holy One,” for example. (Acts iii. 13. 14, 23.) The Jews “denied” by ignoring the Lord’s identity, not by declaring He did not exist. They were the reverse of Atheists, being Deists of a particularly fanatical type. Still, their rejection was a “denial.” Just so is any teaching that ignores or invalidates the real humanity of the Lord a “denial” of His identity with the promised Messiah or Christ of God; and, therefore, John denounces teachers of that sort as “Antichrists.” He does not label them Atheists, or infidels, or unbelievers, however, but “liars” and “deceivers.”

## B.—PARALLEL PASSAGES.

He adds that those to whom he wrote had heard that such persons would appear on earth. (1 John ii. 18.) Probably he alluded to some of the apostolic Epistles, for Peter had said: “There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even *denying* the Lord that bought them,” (2 Pet. ii. 1) and Paul had amplified this by saying that in later times “some shall depart (or fall away) from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies,” (1 Tim. iv. 1) and he warned his readers to “take heed to the teaching; continue in them” (1 Tim. iv. 16) —i.e., do not go beyond the revealed Faith, and do not depart from it: Paul also couples “seducers” from the Faith with deceivers,” (2 Tim. iii. 13) just as John brackets deceivers with liars and Antichrists. Whence it is clear that, to the Apostles, any addition to or departure from the primitive Faith taught by themselves, and involving “denial” of the Lord Jesus, is falsehood, deceit, and anti-Christianity. John singles out, as preeminently anti-Christian, any form of teaching that transgresses the basic fact of our Lord’s real humanity—which teaching involves rejection by God the Father and God the Son—for on that fact depends the entire fabric of man’s salvation and of God’s redemptive scheme, as worked out through Jesus the Christ, Who was born of a woman, and was “God manifest in *the flesh*.” (1 Tim. iii. 16)

The word “deny” (Bishop Latimer (Works, Vol. I., p. 521) said: “Another denying of Christ is this Massmongering. For all those that be Massmongers be deniers of Christ...” ) used by John (Harnoumenos, “the one refusing”) in no way implies Atheism or the denial of the existence of God. (Josh. xxiv. 27; Matt. x. 33; Titus i, 16; 1 Tim. v. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 5) It simply signifies *heretical departure from the truth*, and is so used constantly in the New testament, and in the Septuagint. John particularly had in view his Gospel—written long before—in which he had laid down the basic truth that “the Word became *flesh* and tabernacled among us.” (John i. 14) Men who, in any way, “deny” that basic truth are liars, deceivers, Antichrist, and, evidently, the “spirit of Antichrist” is that which fosters teaching opposed to that basic truth. It is the spirit of falsehood and deceit, -of departure from Christian truth, of apostasy, not of Athe-ism. It is enough to abide not in the teaching of Christ, to be without God. (2 John 9) It is enough to confess not the real humanity of Christ, to be without God. (1 John iv. 3) It is enough to confess not that Jesus the Christ is coming once again in the flesh, to be the Antichrist. (2 John 7)

There is no need to be an Atheist, therefore, to produce this effect. There is neither subtlety nor mystery in Atheism. It is mere materialism; whereas the “mystery of iniquity” has behind it all the subtlety of Satan. For Paul says, of “the Man of the Sin” (or great Apostasy), that his “coming (Parousia) is according to the energy of Satan,” (2 Thess. ii. 9) who, in this dispensation, poses as “an angel of light,” and utilises “false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ” and “ministers of righteousness.” (2 Cor. xi. 13, 14, 15) As “god of this age,” Satan “blinds the mind,” (2 Cor. iv. 4) and causes men to “walk in craftiness” and to “handle the Word of God deceitfully,” (2 Cor. iv. 2) and so hides the real Gospel of Christ, which alone is the Power of God unto salvation to those who credit it. (Rom. i. 16) We have in the New Testament no apostolic warrant for any other form of Antichrist than that sketched by John, by Peter and Paul, which is the reverse of atheistic, and is plainly crafty, pseudo-Christian, apostate, lying, deceitful, endued with satanic power, and handling the Word of God deceitfully—especially in regard to the basic truth of Christ’s proper humanity. Such is “The Antichrist” whose portrait is limned (described) , by John, by Peter, and by Paul in their Epistles.



If we turn to the Apocalypse, the portrait is amplified by the addition of particulars, such as that the Antichrist is an emanation from the abyss; (Rev. xi. 7, xiii. 7, xvii. 8) a foe to Christian witnesses, with whom it wars; and that it goes into “perdition”; thus identifying it with Paul’s “Son of Perdition”; (2 Thess. ii. 3) which term must have been chosen for a special purpose, viz., the identification of the bearer of that name—as it obviously connects him with the false Apostle, Judas, who alone bore that designation, and alone was “lost.” (John xvii. 12. 29) We shall be “wise” (Dan. xii. 3, 10) if we understand this hint, which plainly tells us that *Judas was a type of the Antichrist*; and that, therefore, we are to look for a False Apostle, and not for an Atheistic Prince, as is so unscripturally taught to-day. Can anything be less like the portrait of the Antichrist of John, Peter and Paul than the following: “A scholar, a statesman, a man of unflinching courage and irrepressible enterprise, full of resources and ready to look in the face a rival or a foe”? “a general and a diplomatist.” (Quotes from *The Coming Prince*, by R. Anderson, p. 169 & p. 170.) Many of us wish we had a few such in our midst. It is unfortunate that the author of this imaginary sketch should have omitted: (a) to explain wherein lies the “sin” of such a one; and (b) to complete the category of his imaginary hero’s enormities. For instance, why not add “an actor, an author, a sportsman, an artist, a musician, a philosopher, an astronomer, a scientist, a barrister-at-law, and LL.D. and K.C.B.”? Why limit the accomplishments of such a prodigy?—a prodigy wholly unknown to Scripture, and savoring more of Bombastes Furioso than of Satanic mystery and energy and guile.

In Daniel (Dan. vii. 8, 11, 20, 22, xi. 36-39) and the Apocalypse (Rev. xiii. 3-8, 15-18) the Antichrist is portrayed as a “little horn” speaking “great words” and making “war with the saints,” with a “look more stout than his fellow horns,” and with a “mouth speaking blas- phemies against God, His Name, His Tabernacle, and them that dwell in the Heaven”; a “little horn,” which is also a “king” that “exalts himself” (just as Paul’s “Son of Perdition” does) “above every god,” and magnifies himself “above all,” honoring in his seat the god of Force (Hercules), and using “gold, silver and precious stones and pleasant things” in honour of his God (just as in the Apocalypse (Rev. xvii. 4, xviii. 12) his Church is represented as doing). This “little horn” or “king” is a “head” (Rev. xiii. 3, xvii 9-11) of the well-known symbol of the Romano-Latin power, the fourth “wild beast” of prophecy; i.e., it is a Pagan Latin Form of Rule, for invariably in prophecy a wild beast denotes a Gentile Pagan power. (Dan. vii. 3-7, viii. 3-20; Zech. i. 18, 19; Isa. xxi. 8, 9, xxvii. 1; Nah. ii. 13)

Hence the Antichrist is the eighth or last “horn” or “king” or “head” of the Romano-Latin Pagan Power; i.e., it, in addition to its religious apostasy, wields Pagan rule of a monarchical type within the confines of the Latin race.

In Zechariah (Zech. xi. 16, 17) the Antichrist is described as a “shepherd” that “eats the flesh of the fat” and “tears their claws in pieces” instead of exercising pastoral care over the poor and needy. In other words, he is an ecclesiastical overseer (Dan. vii. 8, 20) of grasping and rapacious tendencies, an episkopos, as Daniel describes him. And this remarkable point of identification is mentioned, viz., that towards the end of his career “the sword shall be upon his arm and upon his right eye; his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened,” a description corresponding to that in Daniel vii. 26, 2 Thess. ii. 8, of the “consumption” of Antichrist’s power, preparatory to his destruction at the Lord’s appearing, and of the darkening of his kingdom in retributive judgment. (Rev. xvi, 10) It is plain that here is indicated deprivation of power by some signal act or process of judgment, contemporaneous, mental obliquity; a process or act of judgment, moreover, connected with “the sword,” i.e., war.

### C.—CLASSICAL AND BIBLICAL USAGE.

The name *ho antichristos*, the Antichrist, is thus described by the learned Elliott (Hore, Vol. I., pp. 67, 68): “A name very notable. For it was not a pseudo-Christ, as of those self-styled Christs (in pro- fessed exclusion and denial of *Jesus* Christ that the Lord declared would appear in Judea before the destruction of Jerusalem, (Matt. xxiv. 24. Mark xiii) and who did, in fact, appear there and then; but was a name of new formation, expressly compounded, it might seem, by the Divine Spirit for the occasion, and as if to express some idea, through its etymological force, which no older word could so well express, Antichrist; even as if the would appear some way as a Vice-Christ, in the mystic Temple or professing Church; and in that character act the usurper and adversary against Christ’s true Church and Christ Himself. Nor did it fail to strengthen this anticipation that the Gnostic heresiarchs, and others, did in a subordinate sense act that very part already; by setting Christ practically aside, while in mouth confessing Him, and pro- fessing (Acts. viii. 9. See also Irenzus, i. 20; Jerome, Tome IV., i. 114; Irenaeus, i. 24; Epiphanius i. 20, etc.) themselves in His place the power, wisdom and salvation of God.”

Elliott thus explains the Greek word *Antichristos*: “When *anti* is compounded with a noun signifying an agent of any kind, or functionary, the compound word either signifies a vice-functionary, or a functionary of the same kind opposing, or sometimes both.

In the New Testament the only compounds of the kind are used in the sense of the *first* class of words; as *anthupatos* —Pro-consul—Acts xiii. 7, 8, 12; xix. 38; and both on that account, and yet more because the old word, *pseudo-Christ*, would almost have expressed the idea of a *counter-Christ*, I conclude that *this* must be St. John’s intended sense of Antichrist.” “I must particularly beg the reader to bear in mind that the word cannot with etymological propriety mean simply a person opposed to Christ; but either a vice-Christ, or counter- Christ, or both.”

“The name—the then new and very singular name that John gave it, under divine inspiration, of Antichrist, while admitting the secondary senses of an adversary of Christ, did yet primarily, indeed necessarily, indicate (according to the etymological formation of the word) that he would be so through his being in some manner a Vice-Christ, or one professedly assuming the character, occupying the place, and fulfilling the functions, of Christ. An excellent comment on its force and significance is furnished by the Romanists’ appellative of Anti-Pope (Greek, *antipapa*), an appellation given in the sense *not simply of an enemy to the Pope*, but of a *hostile self-substituted, usurping Pope*, one occupying the proper Pope’s place, receiving his honors and exercising his functions.”

Such was the view generally adopted by the Fathers; Whether in reference to the prophecies of Daniel, St. Paul, or St. John, they speak of the grand enemy, therein alike prefigured, not as an Atheist so much, but rather as a *usurper er Christ’s place before the world*. So the Greek Fathers generally, e.g., Irenaeus, v.25 Hippolytus, Cyril, Chrysostom, Theodoret. The *Latin* Fathers did not enter into the proper force of the Greek compound, and thus expounded it as ‘an adversary of the Lord,’ so Cyprian; or ‘opposed to Christ,’ so Augustine. Justin Martyr and Chrysostom use *antitheos*, not as a professed rebel against God, but a usurper of His place, by blasphemously proclaiming himself equal to God.”

The learned Rev. M. W. Foye says: “Most English scholars are liable much to mistake the etymological and true meaning of the word Antichrist. After a due examination of the Greek prefix, *anti*, when compounded with a noun personal, I feel assured that the following may be laid down as



a safe general—I would say, all but universal—rule, viz., the Greek *anti* prefixed to a personal noun; signifying a public ministerial functionary; or a ministerial official agent of any sort, public or private, signifies *Pro, in the stead of, substitute, vice, vicar*; prefixed to other personal nouns wt signifies *emulation, rivalry, hostility*.”

These three lists contain all the personal nouns that are found with anti prefixed to them except Christos. The following brief passage from Dion Cassius will put the rule beyond question, so, at least, as regards its first and second branches. “He retained in Italy the names both of imperator and of consul, but as to those rulers who, out of Italy, were governors in the stead of them (anti ekeinon), all these he entitled antistrategous and anthupatous.”

The learned Dr. Wordsworth says: “The person in whom this system is embodied is described as antikeimenos (2 Thess. ii. 4), i.e., literally, one setting himself in opposition, and particularly as a rival foundation, in the place of or against another foundation. Now, be it remembered . . . ‘Other foundation can no one lay than that which already laid (keitoi, remark the word), which is Jesus Christ’ (1 Cor. iii. 11). May not he who calls *himself the Rock of the Church* be rightly called ho antikeimenos?”

“Here is an Antichrist sitting in the Church and teaching errors disguised as Truth; an Antichrist speaking in the name of Christ. Here is a strong delusion, one that may ensnare the world.” (Union With Rome, page 23)

The learned Dr. Wylie says: “John looks for him in the guise of a Deceiver. ‘Little children,’ says John (First Epistle, ii. 19), ‘it is the last time; and as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists.’ Antichrist, says John, is to be a liar (ii. 22). But if he comes boldly and truthfully avowing himself the enemy of Christ, how is he a liar? If he avows, without concealment, his impious design of overthrowing Christ, with what truth can he be spoken of as a deceiver? But such is the character plainly ascribed to him by John (2nd Epistle, verse 7). ‘This is a deceiver and an Antichrist.’ He who. does not confess when he is called to do so, denies. Such is the use of the word in these applications all through the New Testament. Such is the use John makes of it in this very passage: ‘For many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh.’ It is clear that Antichrist, as depicted by our Lord and by His Apostle John, is to wear a mask, and to profess one thing, and act another. He is to enter the Church as Judas entered the garden—professedly to kiss his Master, but in reality to betray Him. *He is to be a counterfeit Christ*. If Antichrist must necessarily be a deceiver—a false Christ—then no Atheist, or body of Atheists, can be Antichrist. No Pantheist, or body of Pantheists, can be Antichrist. They are not deceivers; they are open enemies. And not less does this mark shut us up to the rejection of the theory that Antichrist is a political character, or potentate, some frightfully tyrannical and portentously wicked king, who is to arise, and for a short space devastate the world by arms. This is an altogether different Antichrist from that Antichrist which prophecy foreshadows. Prophecy absolutely refuses to see in either of these theories the altogether unique and over-topping system of hypocrisy, blasphemy and tyranny, which it has foretold. When we are able to put aside some of the false Antichrists, we come more within sight of the true one. We turn now to the prophecy of Paul, and we shall be blind indeed, if, after the study of it, we shall be in any doubt as to whose likeness it is that looks forth upon us from this remarkable prediction.” “No one-man Antichrist, or Antichrist whose reign is to last for only three years and a half, can fulfill the conditions of Paul’s prophecy.”

The “Chronicles of Zachariah of Mytilene” (6th century) Ch. I., par. 1 (Burry’s Byzantine Texts), says: “King Justin made his sister’s son, who was General, Anti-Caesar, and Justinian became Anti-Caesar on the 5th day of the week in the last week of the fast.”

Hales’ Chronology, Vol. II., Part I., p. 550, says: “The Vice-gerent of Jesus Christ, which, by a singular concurrence, meant the same as the obnoxious Antichristus—Antichrist— originally signifying a pro-Christ or deputy-Christ, or a false Christ who assumed his authority and acted in his stead.”

## Chapter II. True Meaning Of The Term.

Now, from all the preceding, we see at once how to interpret *Ho antichristos*, composed of the high official name *Ho Christos* and the prefix *anti*, and thus forming the Divinely revealed title of that great special adversary of Christ and His Church, of whose coming future and direful doings the prophetic Scriptures give so many and such awful warnings; and revealed, too, at the very time when the official arrangements made by Augustus, and their Greek titles, were in full play in the Roman world. It is obvious from the above lists and facts that the true etymological and literal, as well as conventional, sense of this official Greek title, The Antichrist, can be no other than this: The pretended, self-styled divinely-appointed Pro-Christ, Vice-Christ, Substitute-Christ, Vicar-of-Christ or Vicar-of-Christ, as also the Rival-Christ, the Apeiron (Someone who copies the words or behavior of another.) of Christ, the Antagonist of Christ, he who, having no sense of, nor relish nor heart for, the things of Christ, is the enemy and adversary of Christ—the usurper, conscious or unconscious, in Christ's name, of Christ's place, prerogatives, offices, titles and functions in the professing visible Church. Thus, doubtless, it includes all the characteristics in the threefold list, not excepting that of the spiritual Commander-in-Chief of all Anti-Christian forces.

It should be remembered that Christ is said to have given Himself as an anti *lutron* (Greek meaning substitute. 1 Tim. ii. 6; Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45.)—a substitute or ransom in the stead of all—which shows what the Scriptural view of anti is. Neither Scriptural nor classic usage requires us to give another sense to this word, and to restrict it to one who openly, avowedly, and by force, opposes Christ or seats himself in some literal shrine made by man. For apostolic usage does not restrict the word *naos* to any literal shrine; and Paul—who alone employs the word, in 2 Thessalonians ii. 4, of the Antichrist—constantly applies it, in a spiritual or metaphorical sense, to the professing Christian body. (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 21.) So that consistency and sanctified common sense demand alike the application of the word *naos* to the professing Christian body, and of the word *antichristos*—to a false substitute, and therefore a disguised opponent, of Christ—a veiled enemy, not an open one.

The cogency is more evident when the Scriptural use of the word *blasphemia*, (Rev. xiii. 5-7) blasphemy, is taken into account, for that term is invariably applied to *religious* impiety, never to religious opprobrium or foul language. Thus, in John 10:33: “We stone Thee for blasphemy; because Thou, being a man, makest Thyself equal with God.” This was the charge on which the High Priest condemned Christ. (Matt. xxvi. 64, 65) Compare also “He blasphemeth; for who can forgive sins, but God only?” (Matt. ix 3)

There are some twenty-five passages in the Acts of the Apostles where the Jewish Temple is called *hieron*, but not a single one where it is called *naos*, nor is there one in any Epistle where it bears this name. The *naos tou Theou*, in the mouth of an Apostle, speaking to Gentile Christians concerning the future, could not mean the Jewish Temple. It could only mean the Christian Church. As the appellation, “Son of Perdition,” ties the meaning down to some professor of Christianity, so the word “blasphemy” equally restricts the sense to *religious* profanity. Thus these three loops and taches (buttons) concur in pointing to a false Christian, and negate completely any idea of Atheism.

As previously pointed out, a “wild beast” (Dan. vii. 3; Rev. xiv. 9, xiii. 2, 4, xvii. 11, xi. 7, xiii. 1) in prophecy is invariably the symbol, emblem, or sign, of a Gentile, heathen power. To this rule there

is no exception. Hence it is obvious that, in prophecy, as the head” (Rev. xiii. 1, xvii. 9, 11) or “little horn” (Dan, vii. 8, 20) of a “wild beast” must be of like nature or origin, the eighth head, or “the beast,” as it is called, or the Antichrist, is necessarily of Gentile, heathen origin and nature —*not Jewish*.

Thus “the Antichrist” of prophecy is a *false Christian*, a *veiled enemy of Christ*, of *heathen origin*. He is also not only the outcome of the Great Apostasy,(2 Thess. ii. 6) but its consummated Head, its *Apostolic Head*, its *False Apostle* (2 Cor. xi. 13) or “Son of Perdition.” And, besides, he is *ho anomos*,(2 Thess. ii. 8) the *lawless one*, or the prime leader of the “mystery of *anomia*” (2 Thess, ii. 7) which was at work in apostolic days—some secret, religious, Satanically inspired (2 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xvii. 5-7) apostasy from primitive truth, then working inwardly, but subsequently to burst forth into full power and to “reveal” the “Man of the Sin” in the plenitude of “deceivableness” and “strong delusion,” of “blasphemy” and of persecuting proclivities. Augustine said: “If John had said, ‘If any man sin I will pray for him’ . . . who would tolerate it of faithful Christians? Who not view him rather as Antichrist than an Apostle? ”

## Chapter III. Characteristics.

As the “lawless one,” above all laws, as well as the “Man of the Sin,” *ho anthropos tees amartias*, and “the Son of Perdition,” *ho uios fees apoleias*, he exalts himself above all “called god,” or, that is an *object of reverence, sebasma*. The term *ho anomos*, in the Greek, corresponds to the Latin classical phrase, *legibus solutus*, applied to Roman Emperors; “the expression was supposed to exalt the Emperor above all human restraints; and to leave his conscience and reason as the sacred measure of his conduct.”

As *ho antikeimenos* (2 Thess. ii. 4) he is an adversary, for Paul uses that phrase in Phil. i. 28 of the adversaries of Christians; hence he is described as warring with the saints. (Rev. xi. 7, xiii. 7; Dan. vii. 21)

As an oracle (Rev. xiii. 5, 6; Dan. vii. 7, 25; Isa. xxxvii. 23) he blasphemes God, God’s Name, God’s Tabernacle, God’s Heavenly ones, not by abuse, but by usurpation and falsehood. All which characteristics naturally are the logical outcome of the claim to be Christ’s Vicar, and the mouthpiece of God. Whosoever, in the pride of his heart, falsely assumes to be the oracle of God and Christ’s Vicar, cannot but utter “great things and blasphemies.” These are inseparable concomitants. He who claims to be Judge of all, (Harduin, VI., ii, 1650; and Cardinal Manning, 1880, in Pro- Cathedral, Kensington) but incapable of being judged by any, necessarily is the Lawless One. He who makes laws, but is above laws, is necessarily the Lawless One, for no earthly power can reach him.

Combine these features, and you have the Scriptural Antichrist, as Gregory, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 590, long ago perceived.

Such a climax of impiety is not to be reached by man, even though “energized by Satan,” in a brief space of time, or in the lifetime of one human being. Such an idea is contrary to all the marks by which the Holy Spirit has delineated the Antichrist. Particularly so in regard to duration. It is constantly overlooked by writers and speakers that no time limit is fixed to “the Apostasy,” beyond the statement that it began in apostolic days, (2 Thess. ii. 7; 2 John 7) and is to endure until the Second Advent. (Rev. xix. 2) But a definite time limit is fixed for the Antichristian Head of the Matured Apostasy, in “the latter times.” (1 Tim. iv. 1) This time limit is seven times mentioned in varying terms: “a time and times and half a time,” (Dan. vii. 25; xii. 7; Rev. xii. 14) “forty- two months,” (Rev. xi. 2, xii. 5) and “one thousand two hundred and sixty days,” (Rev. xi. 3, xii. 6) in symbolical phraseology. The precedent of the seventy “weeks” of Daniel ix., as well as logic and sanctified commonsense, combine to show that in symbolic prophecy a “time” means three hundred and sixty years, and a “day” a literal year. Hence three and a half “times” are one thousand two hundred and sixty literal years, a period accordant with the magnitude of the Apostasy, and with its duration, which we know has lasted over eighteen hundred years.

Hence the duration of the Bestial Head cannot be three and a half literal years, and must be one thousand two hundred and sixty years—a fact which renders it impossible for a solitary person to be “the Antichrist.” From the nature of the case, and from all the converging lines of identification, the Antichrist must be a “Perpetual Person.” Just as the British Throne enfolds an entire series of persons, each styled “the Sovereign,” so the “Seat” or *Cathedra* of Antichrist enfolds an entire series of persons styled “the Beast,” or “Little Horn,” or “Eighth Head” (of the “Ten Horned, Seven Headed Wild Beast”), or “Son of Perdition,” according to the various phases of the character portrayed; *i.e., species and origin, position among rulers, power of persecution, religious apostasy and blasphemy.*

## Chapter IV. Time of Antichrist's Appearance.

THE time of the appearance of the Antichrist is definitely fixed by Daniel, by Paul, by John. The *first*, places it among the ten heathen horns of the Fourth Wild Beast, which horns *necessarily* are to be sought, neither in the old age and decrepitude of the Wild Beast, nor in its early youth, but, as in Nature, during its maturity and vigour. Hence they cannot be mushroom growths of three and a half years' duration, but must be, as depicted, (Dan. vii. 8, 20; Rev. xvii. 12) contemporaneous with Antichrist's one thousand two hundred and sixty years from the epoch of Apostasy's maturity. The *second*, places its appearance at, or just after, the point when the Caesarean "let," or hindrance, (2 Thess. ii, 6, 7) was removed out of the way,\* a period fixed by history as somewhere between A.D. 330-476-684; a removal by degrees, and by successive stages; Constantine removing the seat of Cesarean power from Rome to Constantinople in A.D. 330, (Rev. xiii. 2, xvii. 11) then the last Western Caesar, Augustulus, being deposed by the Goths in A.D. 476; and then the entire Western Roman Empire being broken up and divided among the various Gothic tribes, described by Macchiavelli, the Romish historian, as numbering ten in the fifth century.

\*Cardinal Manning, in his "Temporal Power," Preface, pp. 42-46, said: "Now the abandonment of Rome was the liberation of the Pontiff, and from the hour of this providential liberation . . . no sovereign has ever reigned in Rome except the Vicar of Jesus Christ." "The abandonment of Rome liberated the Pontiffs and left them free to become independent sovereigns, and take up the sovereignty the emperors had just laid down."

The *third*, places its appearance at some point in history when the "throne," or "seat" of power of the Roman heathen world, was conveyed by Satan—as "god of this age" (2 Cor iv. 4)—to the Revived Head (of the Ten Horned Wild Beast) which was the eighth in order of succession.

Daniel xi, appears to allude to the same epoch of time when it describes the "willful king" of the Romans (Dan. xi. 30, 36, 38) ("Kittim" being Italy), as honouring in his "seat" the Pagan God of Force—Hercules; (See 'The Chair of St. Peter,' by H. Forbes Witherby, pp. 76-84.) for it ties down the period in question to a "king" enthroned in the seat of Latin paganism in the "latter days," extending from the "time of the end" of Daniel xi. 40 to the "time of the end" of Daniel 4, 6, 7—a period of one thousand two hundred and sixty years.

Hence the converging lines of Revelation point to the period between AD. 330 and the resuscitation of Pagan Caesarism after the break-up of Roman power in the West, a period followed by the "Dark Ages"; and they point also to a Latin power seated on the "throne" of the ancient Caesars; and so combine to fix the locality whence the Antichrist was to emerge, as the seven-hilled Metropolis (xvii. 9, 18) of the Fourth Wild Beast of prophecy—Rome.

## Chapter V. Name Locates Antichrist.

IRENEUS had long previously conjectured that the “name of the Beast” was LATEINOS—the Greek spelling of the Roman LATINUS—as that name contains the mystic number six hundred and sixty-six, (l=30, a=1, t=300, e=5, i=10, n=50, o=70, s=200=666.) (**Note from the webmaster:** I don’t understand how or from where the author assigns a numerical value to these letters. Somebody held me please!) and Latins were supreme in Europe from Christ’s day until the disruption of the Roman Empire. Other patristic (church fathers) writers similarly located the Antichrist; for instance, Sybilla said: “The greatest terror and fury of his Empire, and the greatest woe that he shall work, shall be by the banks of the Tiber.”

The confirmation of the application of this to Rome by the unconscious testimony of Pagan poets and historians is very striking. By the grouping together of the first five heads, (Rev. xvii, 10) the order is not more marked in prophecy—of the succession of Roman rulers—than it was in history. The five forms of government, according to Roman historians, were Kings, Consuls, Decemvirs, Dictators and Tribunes. The *Imperial* was the one existing at the time of John and Paul. The seventh received a wound by the sword, (Rev. xiii.) and the resuscitated head became virtually the eighth (Rev. xvii. 11) all alike being pagan in origin and nature, as Daniel vii. teaches by its one headship.

The testimony to the title of Rome as the seven-hilled city includes Varro, Virgil, Ovid, Propertius, Martial, Lucan, and as to the five forms of government it includes Tacitus, Livy, Cassiodorus, and Onuphrius Pauvicius.

The restraining power, therefore, referred to by Paul in 2 Thessalonians ii., was the Imperial power of heathen Rome, as vested in the succession of Caesars; hence the use of the neuter, *to Katechon*, and the masculine, *ho Katechon*. Hence his caution. This restraining power was swayed by a series of single persons (or a “Perpetual Person”), following one another in succession; *ho antichristos* similarly must be a series of single persons, or a perpetual person, the successor of the Caesars after the disruption of the Roman Empire by the sword of the Gothic Nations. The sixth head being the Augustan Caesar, the seventh is either the Diocletian Dynasty, which was displaced forcibly by the Constantinian, or else the seventh must be regarded as continuing till the sword of the Gothic nations gave it a deadly wound, which, however, was healed by the subsequent resuscitation of Roman Caesarism masquerading as “Christian” Pontifex Maximus, the ancient heathen title of the Caesars. Daniel vii. obviously teaches, by its one headship, that all the “heads” are but different manifestations of one and the same pagan form of rule.

The “deadly wound” spoken of in Rev. xiii. 3 was primarily inflicted by the Emperor Theodosius’s Edict for the suppression of Pagan worship. Gibbon (vol viii., p. 116) used this expression: “This last Edict of Theodosius afflicted a deadly wound on the superstition of the Pagans.” He added: “Like Thebes, or Babylon, or Carthage, the name of Rome must have been erased from the earth, if the city had not been animated by a vital principle, which again restored her to honour and dominion” (p. 161); and so healed the wound by making the Bishops of Rome a new Head, the Eighth, of Empire. And in the rise of Papal superstition to supremacy; the deadly wound inflicted on the Seventh Pagan Headship was healed.



# Chapter VI. Identification of Antichrist.

THIS leads us to the identification of this mysterious Power, It is remarkable that three phalanxes of Romish authorities combine in

- A. —Identifying the city of Rome as the Babylon of the Apocalypse;
- B. —The Bishop of Rome as the successor of Caesar seated at Rome;
- C. —The Papacy and Church of Rome as the Antichrist of Scripture.

## **A.—TESTIMONY OF ROMISH WRITERS ON THE APOCALYPSE.**

- (1) The Jesuit, Sylvester J. Hunter, in his “Outline of Dogmatic Theology” (Vol. I., P. 410) says: “There is no room for doubt that by the Babylon of the Apocalypse is meant the city of Rome. And down to the time of the Reformation it was the unanimous judgment of all writers. that the Babylon of St. Peter’s Epistle is this same Rome.”
- (2) Cardinal Newman, before he joined the Church of Rome, in 1840 described the city of Rome as “a doomed city,” clearly pointed to “amid the obscurities of the fearful Apocalypse.”
- (3) Bishop Bossuet, of Meaux (1690), in his work on the Apocalypse, taught that Babylon is a symbol of Rome Pagan (“Préf. sur l’Apocalypse,” § vii.).
- (4) Bishop Walmsley (1771) did the same.
- (5) Cardinal Baronius (“Annals,” sec. xvi., Pp. 344) said: “By Babylon is to be understood Rome.” “Rome is signified by Babylon; it is confessed of all.”
- (6) Cardinal Bellarmine (“De Rom. Pont.,” c. iii., § 2, Preterea, Tome I., p. 232, Colon 1615): “John, in the Apocalypse, calls Rome Babylon.”
- (7) Bishop Bossuet also admitted that “all the Fathers” taught that the Babylon of the Apocalypse is Rome (“Préf. sur l’Apocalypse”).
- (8) Similar avowals might be cited from other Romish theologians, e.g., Salmeron, Alcasar, Maldonatus.

## **B.—ROMISH AUTHORITIES ON HISTORY.**

- (1) Duc de Broglie (“Histoire de l’Eglise,”? VI., 424- 456): “The Bishop of Rome mounted the throne whence the Emperors fell, and took, little by little, the position rendered vacant by the desertion of the successor of Augustus.”
- (2) The learned editor of the “Acta Sanctae Sedis” (V., 324) said of Pope Pius IX.: “The Captain who gloriously fills the place of the ancient Caesars.”
- (3) Pope Pius IX., in his “Discorsi” (I., p. 253), said: “The Caesar who now addresses you, and to whom alone are obedience and fidelity due.”
- (4) Cardinal Manning, in his “Temporal Power” (Preface, pp. 42-46), said: “From the abandonment of Rome (by Caesar) was. the liberation of the Pontiffs.” (2 Thess. ii. 7) “He was *elevated* to be, in his Divine Master’s Name, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.” (2 Thess, ii. 4) “The abandonment of

Rome ...left them free to become independent sovereigns, and to take up the sovereignty the Emperor had just laid down.” (p. 50)

(5) Dr. Dollinger (“The Pope and the Council,” p. 165): “The Popes called their acts by the same name as the Caesarean laws—Rescripts and Decrees.” “The notions about the plenary powers of the Caesars prevalent in the latter days of the Roman Empire had their influence here.”

On p. 133 he says: “... the donation of Constantine was brought forward to show that the Pope was the rightful possessor as heir of the Roman Caesars in Italy.” On the Column of Trajan at Rome, the names of the Caesar who erected it, and of the Pope who restored it, are on the base, and both the Caesar and the Pope style themselves “Pontifex Maximus”!

(6) The monk, Damian, time of Hildebrand (Hallam’s “Middle Ages,” ii., 275), makes Jesus Christ tell the Bishop of Rome that He has removed the regal power and conferred the entire Imperial Roman government upon the Pope.

(7) The Orator of the tenth Session of the fifth Lateran Council (Harduin, IX., 1789) declared that Constantine’s removal to Byzantium ceded to Bishop Sylvester the Roman seat of power.

(8) The Imperial title, “Augustus,” formerly belonging to the Caesars, and the almost equivalent title, “His Majesty,” were subsequently bestowed by the Pope upon Charlemagne and his successors, as token of his own supremacy, as Emperor of the Roman earth (see the Pope’s “*optimum decretum*” cited by Glaber Rodulphus, A.D. 900).

(9) Just as Caesar had the power of making or unmaking sovereigns, assigning kingdoms, or taking them away, so the Bishops of Rome claimed the right to degrade or depose sovereigns, and to deprive them of kingdoms (see Baronius, “Annals”; Foulis, “Roman Treasons,” p. 115; Waddington, ch. xvi., p. 283; Daubuz, p. 585).

(10)-Pius VII., when he fulminated an “Excommunication against Napoleon,” June 10th, 1809, claimed this very authority, saying, “Let them learn that they are subject to our Throne, and to our commands ” (Abbé de Pradt, “Quatre Concordats”).

(11) *Of course* these Popes claimed to possess this deposing power, in virtue of being successors of Peter and Vicars of Christ—not as successors of Caesar; but the claim was false, for no such power was bestowed on Peter, whereas this power was bestowed by the Roman Republic upon Caesar, as its mouthpiece and executive officer; and it was solely as successors of Caesar that the Popes became imbued with the idea of temporal power. The Church of Rome, in its Breviary (May 25th) has a “Saint’s Day” in honor of Pope Gregory VII., because he “deprived the Emperor Henry IV. of his kingdom, and released his subjects from their oaths of allegiance to him.” Innocent III., Honorius III., Gregory IX., Innocent IV., Paul III., Pius V., Gregory XIII., Urban VIII., all used this Caesarean power, enforcing it by the terrors of religious interdict, falsely claimed from Christ.

### **C.—ROMISH EXPOSITORS OF PROPHECY.**

(1) Cardinal Newman, in his Treatise on Antichrist, said, in 1840: “Here is an association which professes to take His place without warrant. It comes forward instead of Christ, and for Him; it speaks for Him, it develops His words, it suspends His appointments, it grants dispensations in matters of positive duty; it professes to minister grace; it absolves from sin, and all this on its own authority. Is it not, forthwith, according to the very force of the word, Antichrist? He who speaks for

Christ must either be His true ambassador, or Antichrist. *There is no medium between a Vice-Christ and Antichrist.*”

(2) Cardinal Manning, in his “Caesarism and Ultramontanism” (1874, p. 36), said: “It is Christ or Antichrist.”

(3) The organ of the “Guild of Our Lady of Ransom,” edited by Father Philip Fletcher, in the February, 1914, number (p. 229), said: “The *Vicar of Christ or Antichrist*. ... If the Pope is not the Vicar of Christ, he must be Antichrist; there is no middle view.”

(4) The Hon. G. A. Spencer, alias “Father Ignatius,” in reply to Dr. Cumming, said: “If the Church of Rome be not the Church of Christ, it is the masterpiece of the Devil; it can be nothing between.”

(5) Hortensius said: “The Pope and Christ make but one consistory, so that, sin excepted, to which the Pope is subject, the Pope, in a manner, can do all that God can do” (Extr. de Translat. Proccl. c. Quant Ab.; see Bishop Lowell’s “Works,” VI., 92, Oxford, 1787).

(6) De Maistre, in his book, “Du Pape,” said: “Without the Sovereign Pontiff there is no Christianity. Without the Pope, the divine institution loses its force, its divine character, its converting power.” (Vol. I., pp. xxii., xxxviii., Vol. II., 153; Paris, 1821, 2nd edition).

(7) The Bishop of Bayonne, in 1896, in his “Pastoral,” said: “We will say to the Pope, in all submission, *even as to the Spirit of God* on the day of Pentecost, ‘O Father of those who are in need, whose Word enlightens and comforts, cleanse us from our faults, uphold our weakness, heal our diseases, make straight our ways, make us obedient to your commands, enfold us in your holy fervour.’” And on his return from Rome, he further said: —

“The Eucharist of the Holy Spirit, which renders Him always present, under the corporeal substance, is the infallible Pope—*os orbis*. It has been said most justly that the Pope is the Ego of the Church—the Pope the visible personification of the Spirit of God. . . The Pope, the incarnation of om Holy Ghost” (“Church Review,” June 25th, 1896, p. 418).

(9) In Italian legendary lore, Satan is always associated with Rome. In the Roman Campagna there is a well-known resort, with a ruin and a cave, of which I possess a sketch. It is called by the Romans, “Sedia del Diavolo,” or “Seat of the Devil.”

(10) Cardinal Newman, in his Essay on the “Development of Christian Doctrine,” says of the Church of Rome: “She is a Church . . . crafty, obstinate, willful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, ruled by a Spirit who is Sovereign in his management over her, and most subtle and most successful in the use of her gifts—that Evil One which governs her. ... Satan ever acts on a system, various, manifold, and intricate, with parts and instruments of different qualities, some almost purely evil, others so unexceptionable that, in themselves, they are really Angels of Light.” (Advertisement, p. v.).

On p. 73 he says: “Rome is either the pillar and ground of the Truth or she is Antichrist.”

(11) Pope Pius X. in 1912 said to the “Apostolic Union” in Rome: “The Pope is the guardian of dogma and morals; he is the depository of those principles which render families honest, nations great, and souls holy; he is the counselor of princes and of people; he is the head, under whom no one can feel himself tyrannized over, *because he represents God Himself. He is the Father (par excellence)*, because he unites within himself all that there is that is lovable, sacred, and *Divine*.”

(12) The *Corpus Juris Canonici*, or Canon Law of Rome, repeatedly asserts that the Roman Pontiff bears the authority of the true God on earth (Corp. Jur. Can. Joan., Gib., t. ii., pp. 6-9).

As the Pagan Caesars were styled “Our Lord and God” (*Dominus et deus imperator*), so the Pope for centuries accepted that title. Innocent III. and Leo X. did so, and the Jesuit Father” Sydney Smith, in his C.T.S. Tract, “Does the Pope claim to be God?”? admits that the “Bishop of the Apostolic See” was “occasionally styled *terrenus Deus*, an earthly God, or *alter Deus in terris*, another God on earth.” In the Gloss on the Extravaganza of Pope John XXII., A.D. 1316-34, the Canon Law styles him “our Lord God the Pope.” This was continued in all editions of the Canon Law up to A.D. 1612, when Protestant exposure caused subsequent editions to suppress the word “God.” But no Pope has ever refused that impious title. On the contrary.

(12a) In the Decretum of Gratian, the foundation of Canon Law, “Satis Evidenter ” (Decret, prima pars discussio, 96, cap. 7, Taurini, 1620), we read: “It is clearly enough shown that the Pope, who it is certain was styled a god by that pious Prince Constantine . . . can neither be bound nor loosed in any degree by the secular power; and that God cannot be judged by man is manifest.” This is ascribed to Pope Nicholas I.

More than 100 examples of extravagances similar to this are collected in the Gravamina adversus Syn, Trident, Restit, p. ii; caus... viii., *ob Tyrannidem Papae*, p. 201, Argent, 1585.

Pereira, a priest and doctor at Lisbon, wrote: “It is quite certain that the Popes have never reproved or rejected this title, for the passage in the Gloss referred to appears in the edition of the Canon Law published at Rome in 1580 by Gregory XIII., and the *Index Expurgatorius* of Pius V., which orders the erasure of other passages, yet leaves this one” (p. 180, English Translation by Mr. Landon, London, 1847. Tentativa Theologia, a Treatise on Episcopal rights, etc., by Father A. Pereira, Priest and Doctor of Lisbon).

When Pope Alexander VI. entered St. Peter’s as Pontifex Maximus, one of the triumphal arches had: “Rome was great under Caesar, but now she is greatest; the former was a man, the latter is a god.” (*Curio Storia di Milano*, Part VII., p. 888).

Pope Innocent III. (Const. Decr., lib. i. de tr. episc., fol. 615) said: “One who occupies the place . . . of the true God on earth.”

Mussus (Episc. Bit. Comment. c. xiv., fol. 608) said: “One whom we regard as God, and whom we ought to listen to as though we heard God speaking.”

Decius (Comment in jus. Pontific, Lec. II.) says: “The Pope can do all things God can do.”

(13) Pope Leo XIII., in his Apostolic Letter of June 20th, 1894, said of himself: “*We hold the place of Almighty God on earth.*” His successor, Pius X., said: “*The Pope . . . is Jesus Christ Himself*, hidden under the veil of flesh,” “all must be subject to him.”

(14) Monseigneur Bougaud, Bishop of Laval, in 1890 applied that very phrase to Leo. XIII., in his “Le Christianisme et les Temps Présents” (4th edit., Paris), and a great deal more to the same effect.

Vol. IV., p. 310, “The Pope is the second method of the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Church.” “The Pope and God are the same, so he has all power in heaven and earth” (Barclay, Cap. XXVII., p. 218, citing Petrus Bertrandus. Pius V., Cardinal Cusa supported this statement).

(15) Dr. Sheehan, Bishop of Waterford, in 1909 said of the Pope: “Before them stood a man who possessed almost incredible power, . . . He simply wielded a mighty power that reached from end to end of the earth, and regulated the words and deeds of millions and tens of millions of people. That power was the invisible power of *the Almighty God*. On that Papal Throne sat one who exercised the *authority of the Great God Himself*, and who *really and truly was the representative of God*.”

(16) The Catechism of the Council of Trent, speaking on the “Sacrament of Orders,” defines Roman bishops and priests as “a kind of mediatory” and “interpreters of God” “who in His name. . . sustain the part of God Himself on earth,” and are therefore “*deservedly called gods*”; and as the Council of Trent (Session XXV.) decreed that princes, bishops, priests, and people, magistrates and officials must “yield reverence to the . . . Supreme Pontiff,” and that “Canons, General Councils and apostolic i.e., Papal enactments . . . must be exactly observed, by all,” and as the “Supreme Pontiff” is the “Papa” or Universal Father of all, he obviously is “*above all that is called God*” on earth, according to Romish teaching. And as the Catechism of the Council of Trent also describes bishops and priests as holding an office “most glorious, than which naught greater can be imagined,” what is to be thought of the “Supreme Pontiff” but that he is God?

(17) The Jesuit organ, “The Month” (Vol. XVIII. for 1879, p. 320) said: “It is false to say that the Pope can in no instance depose a sovereign; we cannot say that they do not possess the power.”

(18) Pope Pius IX. (“Discorsi del Sommo Pontefice, Pio IX., pronunziati in Vaticano, ai Fedeli di Roma e dell’ orba. . .” Vols. I. and II., 1872-3), who himself revised his “Speeches,” is, by the Editor, the Rev. Don Pasquale de Francisicis, described as “the portentous Father of the Nations,” “*the living Christ*,” “*The Voice of God*,” nay, “*God, that condemns*,” “*the Lamb of the Vatican*.”

(19) In these Speeches the Pope alludes to himself thus: ‘Keep, my Jesus, this flock, that God has given to You *and to me*.’ “I am the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and I have the right to employ the very words of Jesus Christ. My Father, those whom Thou hast given me I will not lose” “I am the personal Representative of God on earth.” His foot is “most sacred.” He is “infallible”; “superior to prophets,” and “his words are to be accepted as words proceeding from Jesus Christ.” To him alone is committed, “by Divine Right, the Pastorate of the entire Church.” He is the “Supreme Judge of Christendom.” He denounces as “filthy concubinage” Marriages civilly contracted, and so releases men and women from reciprocal vows and obligations. He possesses authority to “depose princes” and to annul laws made by civil governments. (See also Allocutions of 1855, 1856, 1862, 1863.)

(20) Bishop Clifford (“Pastoral Letter,” p. 12), Cardinal Newman and the “Tablet” (November 21st, 1874) speak of the Pope’s deposing power as a “right,” and in the authorized Edition of Pius IX.’s “Speeches” it is described as “exercised in virtue of Papal authority.” Cardinal Manning (“Vatican Decrees,” PP. 49-51, and “Essays”) says the Pope “has a supreme judicial office, in respect of the moral law, over all nations, and over all persons, both governors and governed,” by the “authority of God.”

(21) This claim is openly made in the Brief of Pope Innocent III., entitled “Novit,” in the “Decretum” of Pope Gregory IX. (“Corpus Juris Canonici,” II., 1, 13, Leipzig Edition, 1839); and in the “Syllabus” of Pope Pius IX. in 1864, and in his Address of July 21st, 1873.

(22) Cardinal Manning (“The Present Crisis of the Holy See,” London, 1861, Pp. 73) said: “The Catholic Church . . . cannot cease to preach the doctrine of the sovereignty, both spiritual and temporal, of the Holy See” (where mark the word “See,” and compare it with Daniel vii. 8). In his “Caesarism and Ultramontanism” (1874, pp. 35, 36), he said: “This is the doctrine of the Bull

*Unam Sanctam*, and of the Syllabus, and of the Vatican Council. Any power which is independent, and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdictions, is (ipso facto) supreme. But the Church of Jesus Christ (i.e., the Papal Church) . . . is all this, or is nothing, or worse than nothing, an imposture and a usurpation—that is, *it is Christ or Antichrist*.”

On the 3rd October, 1869, Cardinal Manning preached a sermon on the Papacy in which he put these words into the mouth of the Pope: “I claim to be the Supreme Judge and director of the consciences of men. I am the Sole Last Supreme Judge of what is right and wrong.”

(23) The “*Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesii Christi*,” issued by the Vatican Council of 1870, after declaring the “Roman Pontiff” to be “Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority,” asserts him to be “Infallible” when defining doctrines of “faith or morals,” and orders all—under pain of damnation—to obey him in matters of “discipline”; because than the authority of the “*Apostolic See*” none is greater, as the Pope is “the Supreme Judge of the Faithful.”

(24) Pope Pius IX., in his *Speeches*, described the triple-crowned tiara of the Pope as a symbol of his *Tri-regno*, touching Heaven, Earth and (heathen) Purgatory (*Discorsi*, i, 133).

(25) Pope Pius X., on November 19th, 1912, said to the “Apostolic Union of Priests” (“Western Watchman,” December 12th, 1912): “And how ought the Pope to be loved? Not by words, but in deed and truth. He who loves me will keep my word. No limit is set to the field in which the Pope can, and must, exercise his authority, and the authority of the Pope is not placed after that of other persons, . . . because he who is holy cannot dissent from the Pope. But you, dear brothers, make solemn profession of your obedience, of your devotion to the Pope.”

On the 30th April, 1922, in the Vatican Throne Room, a throng of Cardinals, Bishops, Priests, and Nuns, boys and girls, who all fell on their knees, were addressed from the Throne by Pope Pius XI., who, in a haughty tone, said: “You know that I am the Holy Father, the representative of God on the earth, the Vicar of Christ, which means that *I am God on the earth*.” (“The Bulwark,” October, 1922, p- 104).

(26) In a tract entitled “*De la Dévotion au Pape*,” dedicated to Pius X., published by Paul Salmon, Tours, 1904, the author, Arsene Pierre Milet, described by Cardinal Merry del Val as “a devout priest,” says: “Since the Pope represents God on earth, we ought to love him as God Himself.”

(27) In the “*Life of Mother Margaret Mary Hallahan*,” with preface by Bishop Ullathorne, p. 430, 1912, we read of the Pope—“it was the God of Earth prostrate in adoration before the God of Heaven”—i.e., the Wafer.

(28) Bishop Ullathorne (*Letters from Rome*) says: “The multitudes kneel when the Pontiff lifts up the God of Heaven and earth in his mortal hands.”

(29) Coadjutor Bishop Luton, on Friday, January 27th, 1922, at St. Patrick’s Cathedral, Auckland, N.Z., preaching about Benedict XIV., said: “The Papacy is old and trained in the knowledge of the world. The statesmen and policies of even the oldest and most experienced cabinets of the world are but as yesterday when compared with those of the ever-renewed line of *White Shepherds of Rome’s Seven Hills*” (*The N.Z. Sentinel*, February 1st, 1922, p. 4).

(30) Tyrrell S.J., in his “ Mediaevalism,” 3rd Edition, p. 70, said: “When we fall at the Pope’s feet to offer him homage of our mind, and to accept his teaching, it is again, in a certain way, Jesus Christ whom we adore in His doctrinal presence.”

(31) Thomas Aquinas (XXXIV. Ed., Paris, xx., 549-580) says: “There is no difference between the Pope and Jesus Christ.”

(32) Dr. Sheehan, Bishop of Waterford (Waterford News, November 20th, 1908) said in a sermon: “It would be hard, no doubt, for those who had not experienced it, to understand the intense feeling of a body of Catholics standing for the first time in the presence of the figure of Jesus Christ” (i.e., the Pope).

(33) Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *De Unitate*, applied John x. 27 to himself, and added, “What Jesus Christ had said of Himself we may truly repeat of ourselves.”

(34) Ferraris, “Prompta Bibliotheca,’ Art Papa: “The Pope is as it were God on Earth . . . so that if it were possible that the Angels might err in the faith, or might think contrary to the faith, they could be judged and excommunicated by the Pope.”

(35) Lord Acton (Quirinus—Letters\_ on the Council, p. 285) reports Speech of Pius IX.: “I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.”



# Chapter VII. Antichrist Revealed by Chain of Evidences

It will be observed from the foregoing, that out of their own mouths Popes, Cardinals, Bishops, Priests and Jesuits have convicted the Pope of Rome of being “The Antichrist” of Holy Writ, and *Ho Antichristos* of prophecy, the “little Horn” of Daniel, and “Willful King” of the Romans, who “doeth according to his own will,” who is seated in a false “Apostolic See,” whose “mouth speaketh great things and blasphemies,” whose official title is “Roman Pontiff,” or Pontifex Maximus, *i.e.*, heathen, who, by deeds and words, by assumptions and claims, poses as God within Christ’s Church, and who “exalts himself above all that (on earth) is called God,” whether they be monarchs or princes, magistrates or bishops.

But these are not the only points of identity between the Scripture portrait and the reality. We have other striking evidences:—

## (a) SEAT OR THRONE OF ANTICHRIST.

For instance, take the “seat” of the False “Apostolic See,” which is thrice mentioned in prophecy, viz., Daniel xi. 38; 2 Thess. ii. 4; and Rev. xiii. 2. There it is referred to as a “seat” (the see of a “seer,” as Daniel vii. 8 describes it), in which the “God of Forces” —*i.e.* Hercules—is honored; as a “*Cathedra*” usurped in the mystical “Shrine of God” or professing Church; and as a “throne” of earthly power derived from the inspirer of Paganism. As already shown, it was described by the Romish Bishop of Waterford as a “Papal Throne,” on which sits “one who exercises the authority of the Great God Almighty Himself.”

This “throne” is thus described in “Christmas Holidays, etc.” (p. 47): “The magnificent throne of the Pope, raised quite as high as the altar, which it fronted, and decked out most splendidly with its cloth of crimson and gold, and the gilded miter suspended above.” . . . “His throne was far more gorgeous than the altar; where they knelled down before the latter once, they knelled down before the former five times; and the amount of incense offered before each was about in the same proportion. Had I known nothing of Christianity, I should have supposed the Pope to be the object of their worship. He was evidently the central point of attraction.”

This “throne” is only used on the occasion of the Pope celebrating Mass on certain “Festivals.” Other “thrones” are used by him on other occasions; as, for instance, the “*Sedia Gestatoria*,” or portable seat, in which he is borne aloft above the heads of all present—“above all that is called God”—whether kings, princes, magistrates, bishops or priests. Here is what “The Universe ” (June 27th, 1846) and the official document, “*Notitia Congre, et Tribunal Curie Romane, Littenburg, 1683*,” both said about the Coronation of a Pope: “After the Election and Proclamation, the Pope, attired in the Pontifical habit, is borne in the Pontifical Chair to the Church of St. Peter, and is placed on the High Altar, where he is saluted (Picart uses the word ‘*adored*’) for the third time by the Cardinals, by kissing his feet, hands, and mouth.” In this portable throne or seat the Pope is carried backwards and forwards between his palace of the Vatican and St. Peter’s.

Picart, the Romish historian of Papal Ceremonies, gives a full account of the Election and Coronation of a Pope, as described in the official Roman “Ceremonial.” It involves five “*Adorations*” of the Pope. In the second he is seated “upon the altar of Sextus’s chapel”; in the third upon “the great altar”; in the fourth on a “throne” under a canopy in the portico of St. Peter’s, and

thence carried to a “throne” in the Gregorian Chapel, where, seated, he receives the “homage” of Cardinals, ambassadors, princes, prelates, etc., the Cardinals kissing his hands, the rest his knees. This is the Fourth “Adoration.”

On the arches raised in honor of Pope Borgia were the words “Rome was great under Caesar; now she is greater: Alexander VI. reigns. The former was a man: this is a god.” Lord Acton (“Letters on Modern History,” p. 79) said: “The scandals in the family of Borgia did not prevent Bishops calling him a god.” Julius II., in the 4th Session of the 5th Lateran Council, A.D. 1512, was thus addressed: “For thou art the shepherd, thou art the physician; thou art the governor; finally, thou art another God on earth,” E. C. Gardiner’s “St. Catherine of Siena” describes Urban VI. as “Christ upon earth.”

Picart unconsciously describes the fulfillment of 2 Thess. ii. 4, for he adds: “The Holy Father is undressed, in order to put on other robes, the color whereof is a type or symbol of his purity or innocence. The Cardinal-deacon clothes His Holiness in a white garment, *who, in the language of Scripture, is to preside in the temple of the Lord.*”

After this the Pope is carried to the “High Altar,” and descends, and ascends his own “throne” — upon which he receives the fifth Adoration.

After this he is carried to the “Benediction-Pew” in his *sedia gestatoria*, under a canopy, supported by Roman conservators and caparions, two grooms in scarlet, carrying fans of peacocks’ feathers, on either side of the chair. The pope ascends a “throne” in the pew, and is invested with the Papal Triple Crown, with the words, “Receive this tiara embellished with three crowns, and never forget, when you have it on, that you are the *Father of Princes and Kings*, and the *Supreme Judge of the Universe* (or ‘Ruler of the World,’ as another authority says); and, on earth, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, our Saviour.” Whereupon, the Pope “blesses” the people thrice; a “Plenary Indulgence” is proclaimed; cannons roar out a triple peal; bonfires blaze; rockets are fired; houses are illuminated; horse and foot soldiers present arms.

Some days later the Pope proceeded in state (this was before 1870) to St. John de Lateran—the Cathedral of the Bishop of Rome—under triumphal arches, and with most gorgeous pageantry of scarlet, gold, silver, silks, purple velvets, satins laced with gold, precious stones, and almost everything enumerated in Revelation xviii. 12, 13—filling a whole folio in small print—there to be again “enthroned” and “adored,” with honors no emperor or king has ever received.

But there is yet another “seat” or “throne” for the Pope. It is in St. Peter’s, at the extreme end of the building, and commands the entire interior. It is over an “altar,” with a colossal reredos (a screen, or decoration placed behind the altar in a church) of bronze, in the center of which is the throne—within which, hidden from view, is the so-called “Chair of St. Peter.” This “throne” is supported by images pretending to be Augustine and Ambrose—Latin \*\* Fathers,” Chrysostom and Athanasius—Greek “Fathers.” Above it is a Dove, surrounded by angels, boys and nymphs, in the midst of rays of light. Angels are gazing down at the Pope’s bronze throne, with the seat inside. Directly under the bronze case is the “altar.” Thus the place of Romish “authority” and “teaching” is above the Sacrifice of the Mass or the Immolated Victim on the altar, i.e., is “above God.”

Directly over the chair, exactly where the occupant’s head rests, is a crown upheld by angelic hands. Above these angels is the emblem of God the Holy Spirit, from which rays of light pour down upon this “throne” or “seat.” It is from this chair that the Head of the Latins, or Lateinos, claims the Headship of the Universal Church of Christ, and from it claims to be “Vicar of Christ,” i.e., in

Greek, Antichristos. It is the False Apostolic Chair, whence are derived the “Petrine claims” of the Latin Papas. Below it is an “altar,” on which this Latin man first makes his God, and then sits in order to be “adored” by those whom the Council of Trent “called gods,” i.e., bishops and priests.

#### **(b) ROMISH TESTIMONY TO IDENTITY.**

Cardinal Wiseman (“Recollections of the Pope,” pp. 229, 230) said: “The Papal throne is lofty, and is erected opposite the altar, in the sanctuary.

“The Altar is the *object of all reverence*, (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4) towards it, all kneel and *worship the consecrated elements there.*” (A terrible admission of idolatry.)

Archbishop Ullathorne said (“Letters from Rome,” p. 216): “The multitudes kneel when the Pontiff lifts up the *God of Heaven* and earth in his mortal hands.”

Cardinal Manning (“Sermon on the Pope’s Jubilee”) declared that “The priest’s hand is the instrument of bringing the *Lord of Heaven on the Altar.*”

Said Mr. Eustace, a Popish priest, who witnessed this “Adoration” of the Pope: “I object not to the word ‘adoration’ . . . but why should the altar be made his footstool? The altar—the beauty of holiness, *the throne* of the Victim-Lamb, *the mercy-seat of the temple of Christianity*; why should the altar be converted into the footstool of a mortal?” (“Classical Tour,” Vol. IV., Appendix, p. 396, Leghorn Edition).

Well might Mr. Gladstone, in his “Rome: Newest Fashions in Religion” (p. 172), ask the Pope to explain the meaning of a photograph sold in Rome by Cleofe Ferrari, representing “a double scene, one in the heavens above, one on the earth below.” “Above . . . is one of those figures of the Eternal Father which we in England view with repugnance. On the right hand of that figure stands . . . the Blessed Virgin Mary, with the moon under her feet (Rev. xii. 1); on the left hand . . . is St. Peter, kneeling on one knee—*kneeling to the Virgin*, not to God. In the scene below . . . on the pedestal is Pope Pius IX., in a sitting posture, with his hands clasped, his crown, the Tri-regno, on his head, and a stream of light falling upon him from a dove, forming part of the upper combination, and representing the Holy Spirit. The Pope’s head is not turned towards the figure of the Almighty. Round the pedestal are four kneeling figures apparently representing the four great quarters of the globe, whose corporal adoration is *visibly directed towards the Pontiff.* . . . We commend this *most profane* piece of adulation to the notice of the Cardinal Vicar.”

That the Antichrist of prophecy is the Latin Papacy is proved by the Roman Missal, the Decrees, Canons, and Catechism of the Council of Trent—when compared with I Tim iii.: 2:Thess. ii.: Rev. xiii., xvii., as well as the following Early Testimonies of the “Fathers”:

*Irenaeus*: “The number of Antichrist’s name shall be expressed by this word, LATINUS”;

*Sybilla*: “The greatest terror and fury of his Empire, and the greatest woe that he shall work, shall be by the banks of Tiber”;

*Jerome*: “Antichrist shall sit in the temple of God, either at Jerusalem, as some think, or else in the Church itself, as we more correctly consider”; “Antichrist shall cause all religion to be subject to his power”;

*Gregory I.*—“I speak it boldly, whosoever calleth himself Catholic Priest, or desireth so to be called, in the pride of his heart, is the forerunner of Antichrist”; “By this pride of his (John, bishop of

Constantinople), what thing else is signified, but that the time of Antichrist is even at hand”; “The King of Pride is coming to us, and an army of priests is prepared ...”;

*Bernard*: “The Beast that is spoken of in the Book of Revelation ... is now gotten into Peter’s chair,” and though these words were spoken against Petrus Luna, who usurped the see of Rome in the time of Pope Innocent VII., they prove that in (Romish “Saint”) Bernard’s judgment the Antichrist can sit in Peter’s chair: “Bestia nolens os loquens blasphemias occupat Cathedram Petri”; (From Google translation of the Latin: Beasts unwillingly speaking blasphemies occupy the Chair of Peter.)

*Joachim Abbas*: “Antichrist is already born in Rome, and shall advance himself higher in the Apostolic See”;

*Arnulphius*, in the Council of Rheims: “What think you, reverend Fathers, of this man sitting on high in his throne, glittering in purple, and cloth of gold? Verily if he be void of charity . . . then he is Antichrist sitting in the temple of God, and showing out himself as if he were God”;

*The Bishops in the Council of Reinspurg*: “Pope Hildebrand under a color of holiness hath laid the foundation for Antichrist”;

*Dante* calls Rome the “Whore of Babylon”;

*Petrarch*: “Rome is the Whore of Babylon, the Mother of Idolatry and Fornication, the Sanctuary of Heresy, and the School of Error.”

### **(c) HEATHENISM DISGUISED.**

The “Chair of St. Peter” is heathenish. The “altar” below it is heathenish. The “Adoration” of the Pope is heathenish. The “kneeling” to the image of the Virgin is heathenish. The peacocks’ feathers, or *Filabelli*, are heathenish (Egyptian). The processions and pageantry are heathenish. Everything about the Latin man and his religion is heathenish—Romish Cardinals and Archbishops being witnesses. Thus the “Archbishop of Birmingham,” in his Mid-Lent Pastoral, in 1917, said: “During Passiontide the Church, by her public offices and liturgy, and by the draping of *altars and statues*, intimates . . . the Sacred Passion. Yet on Maundy Thursday she puts off her garments of sorrow and resumes her festal attire . . . that we may . . . rejoice in the institution of the *adorable* sacrifice” of the Mass! This is imitated from the old Pagan worship, in which the clothing of the gods occupied an important place (see Homer’s *Iliad*, vi. 269-311).

The bronze statue of St. Peter at Rome was formerly a statue of Jupiter—as Torrigio (8th century) admits (*II Vaticano Illustrato*, and Brock’s *Rome: Pagan and Papal*, p. 121). On various annual solemnities, it is the custom to clothe this image in full Pontifical dress, “and so to present it for the worship of the faithful, rich with gold and gems” (*Ibid.* pp. 123 and 431)... Picart (Vol. I., p. 13) thus refers to the modern Romish custom of kissing images: “With us the priest kisses the altar, the cross, the relics, the thurible, the paten and the chalice.” The bronze image of St. Peter is brightly polished by the kissings and rubbings of worshipers, including the Pope. Cardinal Baronius (d. 1607) was the first to introduce its worship . . . which laudable custom others followed, to the wearing away of the brass of the statue” (*Ciacconius*: 4 vols. fol. Rome: 1677). 600 years B.C., apostate Israelites kissed the calves (*Hosea* xiii. 2), and a century earlier, they adored Baal and kissed the bloodstained idol of Phoenicia (*2 Kings* xix. 18), just as the heathen used to kiss the image of Hercules at Agrigentum.

Rome boasts that it has “Christianized” Paganism by adopting its worship, and changing the names of the images! In reality it has paganized Christianity!

The following extract from the *Christian World* supplies the answer:—”Newman, in a passage of his ‘Essay on Development,’ speaking of the early Catholicism in its contact with the heathen world, says:— ‘Temples, incense, lamps, and candles, votive offerings, holy water, asylums, holy days, and seasons, processions, blessings on the fields, sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure, the ring in marriage, turning to the east, images, and the Kyrie Eleison are ALL OF PAGAN ORIGIN, and sanctified by their adoption into the Church.’ Pope Gregory the Great, in his letter to the English missionaries, gives the rationale of the process. ‘Let them,’ he says, ‘hang garlands round their temples, turned into churches, and let them celebrate such festivals with modest repasts. Instead of immolating animals to demons, let them kill such animals and eat them . . . so that, by allowing them such material pleasures, they may the more easily be brought to share in spiritual joys. For it is impossible to expect savage minds to give up all their customs at once.’”

The passage from Cardinal Newman will be found in his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, London, 1846, p. 359.

#### **(d) FULFILLMENTS OF PROPHETIC FEATURES.**

This leads us to the fulfillment of Revelation xiii. 11-17 and xix. 20, or the identification of the “False Prophet” or Pagan False Priesthood, for that that is the meaning of “two horns like a lamb” is clear from the facts: (1) that our Lord used a parallel simile to denote false Christian ministers (Matthew vii. 15); and (2) the word “Lamb” is everywhere in the Apocalypse the symbol of Christ, and therefore the figure necessarily denotes a False *Christian* ministry; which, being a “Wild Beast,” is of heathen origin.

Now the “Canon Law” of Rome is a compilation of documents, some of them emanating from Popes, but the majority from Papal Councils and so-called “theologians” and Romish priests. It is principally in this enormous “Corpus Juris Canonici” that are found all the false claims of the Popes, their false teaching, their false history, their usurpations. It is in the “Canon Law” that the Pope is called God, (Decretum Gregorii, XII.) and “Lord God.” (Decretals, Gregory IX.) It is in the “Canon Law” that the Pope is described as “God, because he is God’s Vicar.” (Decretals of Innocent.) In fact, Romish writers style the “Canon Law” and “Decretals” the “Pope’s Oracle,” as representing the Pope’s mind. Romish casuists say of the Pope: “As Christ was God, he, too, was to be looked on as God.” The “Sacrum Ceremoniale” speaks of “The Apostolic Chair” as “The Seat of God.” By permission of priestly superiors, works are published by Romish ecclesiastics, styling the Pope “Vice-God.”

Papal excommunications and anathemas are styled “Fire from Heaven” by Papists. Thus Gregory VII. spoke of Henry IV. as “*struck with thunder*”—*afflatum fulmino*; and at the first Council of Lyons, the excommunication of the Emperor Frederick by Pope Innocent is described thus: “These words, uttered in the midst of the Council, struck the hearers with terror, as might the flashing thunderbolts, when, with candles lighted and flung down, the Lord Pope and his assistant prelates flashed their *lightning fire* against the Emperor.

In the Roman “Pontifical,” compiled by ecclesiastics, the following is put into the mouths of Popish Bishops when threatening the “greater excommunication” (or, as it is called in Ireland, “Putting fire to your heels and toes”): “We adjudge you to be anathematized and condemned with the devil and

his angels, and all the reprobate *in eternal fire* . . . “; “We separate (Rev. xiii. 15, 17) you from the fellowship of all Christians and exclude you from the threshold of the Holy Mother Church in Heaven and earth, and decree you to be excommunicated.”

By a General Papal Council of Ecclesiastics was the Bull “Unam Sanctam” enacted, which subjected everyone to the Pope. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, himself realized the force of the prophecy when he declared, “The King of Pride is at hand; and an army of priests is prepared,” “because the clergy war and strive for mastery and advancement, who were appointed to go before others in humility”; “*under the aspect of sheep* we nourish the fangs of the wolf.” History tells us that from the time of Gregory, the ecclesiastics of Rome were one body, under one papal head, bishops lording it over secular priests, abbots and generals of monastic orders over the “Regulars”; —“Seculars” and “Regulars” forming the “two horns” of the pretended Lamb-like pagan hierarchy, all alike employed in deceiving the laity, and enforcing the claims of the Pope, “before him” (Compare 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2) i.e., with his sanction, approval and support.

It must never be forgotten that as “Bishop of the Apostolic See,” the Pope claims the headship of the Universal Church, and lordship over all ecclesiastics—Regular and Secular; whilst, in his capacity as successor of the Caesars, and occupier of their “throne,” he claims the lordship over all temporal powers in the Roman earth. Beyond and above these two claims, he, as “Vicar of Christ,” or “Vice-God,” poses as “King of Kings, and Lord of Lords,” with power over Heaven, and Earth, and Purgatory—a claim embodied in the Triple Crown he wears.

#### St. Peter’s and the Vatican.

Hence the Bull “Unam Sanctam” declares it *essential to salvation to be subject to the Pope*. Accordant with which claim, all ecclesiastics take the vow of “obedience,” and receive the Sign of the Cross (“Pontificale Romanum,” p. 49) as a sign of obedience to the Pope; and these, in turn, administer to emperors and kings, and to all within the confines of the Latin Church, the oath of submission to the Pope,



and fealty—along with the “Sign of the Cross,” which is impressed upon the foreheads, or hands, with the right hand of the operator—even as a great army of soldiers under the papal banner—from birth right onwards to death.

When the Crusaders captured Jerusalem, they established “the *Latin* kingdom of Jerusalem,” they all being Papists. And when the Easterns separated from the Westerns, they denominated the latter, because of their subjection to Rome, “the Latins,” a name which has ever since the sixth century described the religion emanating from Rome, as well as the nations connected with that city. “Latin” has been the peculiar distinctive title of the Popedom, of its religion, of its hierarchy, and of its “Image” or Representative Oracle – Papal Councils. Historians, with one accord, describe “the Latin world,” “the Latin Kingdoms,” “the Latin Church,” etc. The only Bible ever adopted by Rome is the Latin Vulgate. Papal Bulls, Papal Councils, the Mass, all speak in Latin. Hence Irenaeus’s elucidation of the “Name of the Beast” as the name of the man. Lateinos, was marvel- lously “wise.”

#### **(e) THE NAME OF A MAN.**

Now, who was Lateinos (or Latinus, in Latin)? He was the head and originator of the Latin race—a prince, supposed to be the son of Faunus and the nymph Marcia. He ruled the country bordering on the Tiber. His daughter, Lavinia, married Aeneas, the Trojan, and from them were descended the founders of Rome, viz., the people of Latium, or Latins. Julius Caesar claimed lineal descent from Aeneas and *Latinus*—the first Latin man. “*The*” Beast bears his name. The “name of the Beast,” therefore, is Latin. “The Beast” itself must be a “Head” within the confines of the fourth Wild Beast of Prophecy—or Latin Power of Rome—as all admit. It must be arrogant and self-exalting; its voice must be imperious and loud; in its “seat” or “throne” must it honor Hercules, the pagan god; its coadjutor and myrmidon must professedly be a Christian “prophet” or priestly class—with “two Lamb-like horns”—claiming miraculous powers, displaying intolerance, and insisting on a pagan symbol as a mark of faith, on pain of excommunication, or as expressed in Revelation xiii, 15-17, “that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark or name of the Beast, or the number of his name”—which, translated from symbol to fact, means boycotting, or exclusive dealing against all who were not signed with the mark of the Beast, i.e., the Cross, or were not Latins, i.e., Papists.

#### **(f) REVELATION XIII. 17.**

All this, and much besides, has been realized by the Papal Ecclesiastics—Regular and Secular—for the past twelve hundred years. A canon of the Lateran Council, under Pope Alexander III., decreed that no one should entertain or cherish heretics in his house or land, or *exercise traffic with them*.

The Synod of Tours forbade Papists from buying from, or selling to, “heretics”; so, too, the Council of Constance. In short, no “heretic” may be traded with, or associated with, by any “good Catholic,” according to Canon Law and Romish teaching. Hence the “boycotting” in Ireland, and the priestly condemnation of “Protestants,” the “No- Rent” manifesto, and all the bigotry and intolerance displayed by Jesuits, monks, nuns, and priests of Rome, who claim superhuman power—even that of changing bread into God, of compelling Christ to descend every day from Heaven, to consign to Hell-fire, to immolate Christ, to “put fire to heels and toes,” to forbid commercial transactions and to command persecution. “The History of Freedom and Other Essays,” by John E. E. Dalburg Acton. Edited by J. N. Figgis, Lit.D., and R. V. Lawrence, M.A., pp. 138- 141. (Macmillan, 1909.) “It is part of the punishment of heretics that faith shall not be kept with them. It is even a mercy to kill them, that they may sin no more.”



**(g) THE LAWLESS ONE (HO ANOMOS). 2 THESS. II. 8.**

Nor is there any difficulty in identifying HO ANOMOS, the Lawless One, or person exempt from law. For, not only by Papal Bulls, Edicts, Encyclicals, and Decrees have commands been issued deliberately contrary to God's Laws, Christ's injunctions, and to Scripture—such as clerical celibacy, monastic fasting and false piety, persecution of heretics, crusades, marriage within prohibited degrees. (for instance, the Duke of Aosta was allowed by Pope Leo XIII., for the sum of £4,000, to contract an incestuous marriage with his own sister's daughter, Princess Letitia), indulgences, canonization of the dead, deposing power, temporal power, and so on; but also claims have been, and are, put forth absolutely opposed to Truth, to fact, and to earthly laws made by nations and rulers for the betterment of their states; claims to be above all law. "*Papa solutus est omni lege humana*. The Pope is exempt from all human law."

Cardinal Manning, speaking for the Pope, said: "I am liberated from all civil subjection . . . I acknowledge no civil superior. I am the subject of no prince . . . The subject of no one on earth . . ."

In the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX. we read that the Pope "is said to have a heavenly power; and hence he changes even the nature of things, applying the substantials of one thing to another, and can make something out of nothing; and a judgment which is null he makes to be real; since in the things which he wills his will is taken for reason; nor is there anyone to say to him: 'Why dost thou this?' for he *can dispense with the Law*; he can also turn injustice into justice by correcting and *changing the Law*, and he has the fullness of power."

By the Vatican Decree of July, 1870, it was declared that "such definitions of the Roman Pontiff . . . are irreformable."

Indeed, the very words of Daniel vii, 25 were embodied by the Pope in one blasphemous Decree: "Wherefore, no marvel if it be in my power to *change times and laws*, to alter and abrogate laws, to dispense with all things, *yea, with the precepts of Christ*." This was Pope Nicholas.

The Romish "Canonist," Reiffensteul, as well as other authorities and Popes, deliberately have taught that the Pope has power to "absolve" from oaths, to "dispense from" oaths, to "annul" oaths, and, generally, to play fast and loose with oaths. In the "Decretum," Part II., Canon XV., Quaest. VII., we read that the Pope's authority "altogether annuls unlawful oaths," "absolves from oath of allegiance"; and that "those subject to an oath of allegiance to an excommunicated person, are not bound." In the "Decretals of Gregory," Book II., tit. xxiv., ch. xxvii., says: "An oath taken against the Church's interest does not bind."

That this teaching is acted upon we have evidence. Thus Pope Pius IX., in his "Encyclical" of February 5th, 1875, declared certain Prussian Laws "null and void," and excommunicated the framers of them ("Tablet," February 27th, 1875).

In 1855 he declared to be absolutely null and void the Laws of the Piedmontese Government; and of the Kingdoms of Sardinia and of Spain; in 1856 those of Mexico; in 1862 those of Austria; in 1863 those of New Granada; on the ground of the inherent right of the Pope to disannul all Laws relating to the Roman religion (see "Constitutio Apostolicae Sedis" also, which was in 1869 substituted for the Bull, *In Caena Domini*).

Lord Acton tells us that Pope Gregory XIII.'s reply to the French King's announcement of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was "that he desired *for the glory of God*, and the good of France, that the Huguenots should be extirpated utterly" ("North British Review," October, 1869).

Pius V. declared that he would release a culprit guilty of a hundred murders rather than one obstinate heretic. He wished to destroy Faenza because of its “heresy.” He adjured the French King to make no terms with Huguenots, and not to observe the terms he had made. He ordered them to be pursued to death. The same ideas pervaded the “sacred College” under Pope Gregory (Ibid.).

Lord Acton (“Essays on Liberty,” pp. 140, 141) said that the many plots and massacres that brought disgrace upon the Church of Rome were based on the theory that: “Treaties made with heretics, and promises given to them, must not be kept, because sinful promises do not bind, and no agreement is lawful which may injure religion or ecclesiastical authority.

“No civil power may enter into engagements which impede the free scope of the Church’s law. It is part of the punishment of heretics that faith must not be kept with them. It is even mercy to kill them that they may sin no more.”

The Jesuit organ, “The Month” (Vol. XVIII. for 1879, p. 320), said: “It is false to say that the Pope can, in no instance . . . absolve from an oath.”

As further examples of Papal lawlessness, let the following be considered. Pope Innocent III. said: “We can dispense from law, according to our plenitude of power over law” (“Decret. Greg. IX.,” 8, iv.). Pius IX., writing to Count Duval de Beaulieu (“Allegemeine Zeitung,” November 13th, 1864), said that “the Church” has power over the Government of Civil Society, and direct jurisdiction and right of interference in temporal matters. (It is on this evil principle that the Popish Bishops in Ireland have lately urged opposition to Conscription—a matter wholly outside “the Church”), The Jesuit organ in Rome, “Civiltà Cattolica” (1885, Vol. I., p. 55), actually described the Inquisition as “a sublime spectacle of social perfection”; and the Jesuit, Schrader, supporting Pope Pius IX.’s “Syllabus,” said that the Popes have never exceeded the bounds of their power, or usurped the rights of princes. Pope Clement IV., in 1265, sold millions of South Italians to Charles of Anjou, for a yearly tribute of 800 ounces of gold, and threatened excommunication if the first installment was late; whilst, if the second tarried, the entire nation would incur interdict (Raynaldus, p. 162).

One far-reaching claim is that every baptized person is, *ipso facto*, a subject of the Pope, willy-nilly, even though outside the Latin Church, and so subject to Papal Law (Dollinger, “The Pope and the Council,” p. 163). This claim was made by Pius IX. when writing to the Emperor of Germany, shortly after the downfall of Papal temporal power in 1870.

The Canonist, Kirchenrecht (7 Vols. Regensburg, 1855- 72, translated by G. Phillips), lays down the rule that “the Church has dominion over those without, as well as those within. The latter, by baptism, are sworn vassals. Anyone who rejects any doctrine is a ‘formal heretic.’ He need not belong to any sect. The Church is entitled to proceed to compulsion by virtue of the jurisdiction over baptized persons which belongs to her. She cannot tolerate heresy.”

Pope Leo XIII. urged that the scholastic philosophy of Thomas Aquinas be taught in all seminaries and schools. Aquinas taught that “Christ is fully and completely with every Pope in sacrament and authority.” The Pope can establish new confessions of faith; whoever rejects his authority is a “heretic” (Summa ii., 2, Q. 1, Art. 10; Q. xi., Art. 2, 3). Aquinas, using spurious writings of Cyril, taught that there is no difference between Christ and the Pope, and represented the Early Fathers as saying that the rulers of the world obey the Pope, as Christ (Opus xxxiv., xx. 540:580, Ed. Paris).

Bishop Cornelio Musso, of Bitonto, preaching in Rome, said: "What the Pope says we must receive as though spoken by God Himself. In Divine *things we hold him to be God.*" (Consciones in Ep. ad Rom, p. 606).

Pope Benedict XIV. said: "No one who is not Bishop of Rome can be styled successor of St. Peter" (De Synod Dioeces., II., i.).

Some of the Papal claims have been founded on, and are supported by, forgeries (see Dollinger's "The Pope and the Council," and Littledale's "The Petrine Claims"). Yet the Canon Law containing those forgeries is still in use by Popes and Papists. Thus Cyprian's alleged evidence in favor of Papal claims, admittedly a forgery, has actually been replaced in the text by F. Hurter, S.J., in his "Sanctorum Patrum Opuscula Selecta," and is cited as genuine by Mr. Allnutt, in his "Cathedra Petri," both of which works received Papal approval. Thus literary falsification is one of the characteristics or lawless features of the Papal system. It is a feature characteristic of ultramontaniam, so much so that one may stigmatize Popery as systematized lies, *to pseudos*, and utterly opposed to the Truth as it is in Jesus; hence, the system is emphatically *anomos*, lawless.

Hence, when one reads such Papal Canonists as Ferraris, and finds them saying: "Ubi Papa, ibi Roma," or styling the Bishop of Rome, "Pope of the Eternal City, the Apostolic Diocese" (Baronius, An., 445, IX., X.), or "Pope of Old Rome, the Patriarchal See" (Synod of Constance, A.D. 859), one is prepared for almost any untruth whose object is the enhancement of the Pope's claims to be what he is not, and never was. Even so, however, one can hardly conceive the possibility of lawless disregard for Truth, fact, and history, to soar to such heights as the subjoined extract from the Vatican Council of 1869-70's "Decretum de Ecclesia."

"The Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of blessed Peter, Princes of the Apostles and the true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and Father and teacher of all Christians, and that full power was given to him in blessed Peter, by the Lord Jesus Christ, of feeding, ruling, and governing the Church Universal."

For this claim, thus phrased, is precisely a paraphrase of the Holy Spirit's delineation of the Antichrist, the the Sham Christ. Accompanied, as it was, by the blasphemous Decree of Papal Infallibility, it may be taken as God's exposure of the "Lie," the evidence forced by the Almighty from the "great voice" on seven hills, that he is "of his father the Devil," for Satan was a liar from the beginning, and the Father of Lies; and Antichrist is Satan's consummated mystery of iniquity (2 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xi. 7; xvii. 8; John ix. 44; viii.44); his earthly spokesman; his Vicar.

#### **(h) BURIAL OF HERETICS AND BOYCOTTING. REV. XI. 9.**

It was predicted in Revelation xi. 9 that the burial of witnesses for Christ should be proscribed by Antichrist's followers; and in Revelation xiii. 17 that trading should be forbidden to "heretics."

It is distinctly laid down in the Decrees of the Third Lateran Council (Decret. Greg., Lib. V. tit. vii., cap. 8, as cited by Priest Bailly, tome iii, p. 139) that "heretics and those who defend and receive them shall be placed under anathema, and we prohibit under anathema that any shall presume to have them, or to entertain them in their house or in their territory, or to *carry on any negotiation with them.*\* But if any die in this iniquity, neither under pretense of any privileges of ours granted to any such, nor under any other pretext whatsoever, let any offering be made for them, *nor let them receive burial among Christians.*"

\* Liguori: Moral. Theol., Lib. VII., §188, etc., defines “greater excommunication,” “os, orare, vale, communio, mensa, negatur,” thus: “os,” all conversation, and intercourse, are forbidden; “orare,” all communion in spiritual things is forbidden; “vale,” all salutations are forbidden; “communio,” marriage, dwelling together, working at the same trade, walking together, are forbidden; “mensa,” all intercourse in food, society, or commerce. This ‘greater excommunication’ was hurled by Pope Pius IX. in 1855, against Sardinia, for passing acts of toleration and reform.

Burial of Heretics is forbidden in Butler’s Catechism, Lesson XXI.: “What punishment has the Church decreed against those who neglect to receive the blessed Eucharist at Easter?” Ans.: “They are to be excluded from the House of God while living, and deprived of Christian burial when they die.” See also Dr. Douglas’ Catechism, Lesson XXI. They both quote the Council of Lateran, 21st Canon.

This is more clearly enforced in the Canon, *Quicumque Haereticos*, which declares: “Whosoever shall have presumed to give knowingly Christian burial to heretics—those who believe, receive, defend or favor them, let them know that they are placed under sentence of excommunication till they shall have made suitable satisfaction.

“Nor let them deserve the benefit of absolution till, with their own *hands*, *they shall publicly drag from the tomb and cast out the bodies* of damned persons of this sort, and let that spot be destitute of sepulcher for ever.” (Sext. Decret. Lib. V., tit. ii., cap. 2, Alexander IV., A.D. 1258. Corpus Jeris Canonici, tome ii. Magdeburgh, 1747).

Here we have a most conspicuous fulfillment of Revelation xi. 9 in medieval days. But modern fulfillments are at hand also. Thus the Belfast “News Letters” of December 15th, 1891, reported a case where the Protestant Rector of Christ Church, Bessbrook, found a coffin close to his house. It contained the corpse of a Protestant, named Patrick Kinney, who had been buried a week previously in the Romish Cemetery at Mullaglass. Because he had formerly been a Papist, but married a Protestant, and declined a Popish priest’s services when dying, the Papists, “with their own bands, dragged from the tomb and cast out the body” of this “heretic,” exactly as directed in the Corpus Juris!

In Canada, serious riots took place in 1875 over the burial of a man named Guibord, a member of the “Institut Canadien,” which had been denounced by the Popish Bishop of Montreal. Eight years previously, viz., in 1867, Guibord died, but the Popish authorities refused him burial in their cemetery. On appeal to the Law Courts and Privy Council, a mandamus was issued for burial in the Popish cemetery. It took eight years of costly litigation to obtain this; but the Papal authorities engineered a mob riot, which stoned the hearse, filled up the empty grave, and then the Popish Bishop of Montreal declared that if the body was buried by force, he would curse and interdict the ground it lay in! (“New York Times” and “New York Herald,” September 11th, 1875; “Times,” November 17th, 1875.) The object of this Bishop and the Papists was to assert the supremacy of Canon Law over British Law.

In 1877 a case occurred in Vineland, New Jersey, where Joseph Maggioli, a Romanist, had been buried in the Popish cemetery. The priest wrote to the widow, ordering her to remove the body, under pain of having it forcibly removed, and of prosecution for trespass. His name was P. Vivet. Owing to the indignation aroused the priest said that “he would have a line drawn round Maggioli’s grave, so that it should be left in unconsecrated ground” (“Boston Congregationalist,” 1877). In 1878 the “Montreal Witness,” of June 13th, reported “A Guibord case” in Cleveland. A Romanist, named Joseph Oberle, was a prominent Forester. The Popish priest refused to bury him in consecrated ground, although Oberle had paid for a plot of ground.

Owing to the high-handed action of the Popish Archbishop Vaughan, of New South Wales, in 1882, the “Times” (January 31st, 1882) used these words: “No quarter is given to any backsliding Romanist who presumes to have an independent opinion. He is put out of communion with his Church; and while denounced during his life, the *rites of sepulture* (burial) *are withheld from his remains after death.*”

In France, up to 1881, the Popish Law closed the cemetery gates against dead Protestants, Dissenters, unbaptised babes and suicides. During a debate in the Chamber, the Popish Bishop, Frappel, said: “One Protestant corpse in a Catholic cemetery *would profane and desecrate the whole place.*” One M.P. declared that Protestants had been forced to bury their dead in fields and gardens, owing to the priests. The Chamber was so disgusted with the conduct of the Papal party that it declared, by 348 votes to 120, that cemeteries in France should thenceforward be thrown open to dead Protestants (“Morning Advertiser,” 1881).

In Prussia the priests tried the same system, but under Bismarck’s regime got the worst of it. The Romish paper, “The Universe,” of February 11th, 1882, waxed furious in describing two cases, where priests were indicted and punished for not allowing burials in “consecrated ground.” In one case, that of a poor little baby, who had not been baptized, this Popish paper described it, like the adult, as an “infidel.”

This heartless and relentless cruelty is quite accordant with the teaching of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, which declares that: “All, unless regenerated through the grace of baptism, are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction,” and that “infants, unbaptized, cannot enter Heaven.” (Donovan’s Translation, pp. 171, 172, 173, Dublin, 1820).

“The Times” of January 23rd, 1834, reported a shocking case at Carrickbeg, Co. Tipperary, where a crowd of fanatical Papists tried to prevent the burial of a corpse, “amid the most fearful imprecations on the deceased, and threats that they *would dig up the body.*”

The “Irish Times” of September 9th, 1921, described the taking over, by Benedictine nuns, of a former Protestant church at Kylemore. The Popish Archbishop of Tuam said that originally “the church was not built for proselytizing purposes. It was built as a place of Divine worship for Mr. Mitchell Henry’s own family, for all whose members *the priests and people of the district had the greatest esteem.*” The priests and people manifested this esteem by casting out Mr. and Mrs. Mitchell Henry’s ashes from the little church he had built, and where they had reposed in peace for years. It was only after the expulsion of their poor remains that the church could be dedicated by the Popish Archbishop to its new use—as a Popish fane (church) (“The Catholic,” October, 1921; p. 109).

#### **(i) REMOVAL OF THE “LET.” 2 THESS. II. 6, 7.**

In 2 Thess. ii. 6 “what withholdeth” is neuter; in verse 7. “he who letteth” is masculine. Ere the man of the Apostasy could be “revealed,” the obstruction had to be removed “out of the way,” this obstruction being swayed by some Perpetual Person.

What was the restraint which, in Paul’s day, hindered the manifestation of the Man of the Apostasy? Tertullian, in the second century, said: “What is this restraining Power? What but the Roman State.” Similarly, Iraeneus affirmed that on the dismemberment of the Empire then in existence, the catastrophe would occur. So Cyril, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine, Jerome in the fifth century — this lest adding, “Let us therefore say what all ecclesiastical writers have delivered to us, that

when the Roman Empire is to be destroyed, ten Kings will divide the Roman world among themselves, and then will be revealed the Man of Sin”; “he who hindereth is taken out of the way, and we consider not that Antichrist is at hand.” So again, Justin Martyr and Hippolytus, the latter saying: “This [Rome] is the Fourth Beast, whose Head was wounded, and healed again; and Antichrist will heal and restore it.” Cyprian, likewise, spoke of the imminent proximity of Antichrist in his day.

It was this early Christian tradition that caused Christians to pray for the continuance of the heathen Roman Empire. Thus Lactantius: “Beseech the God of Heaven that the Roman State might be preserved, lest, more speedily than we supposed, that hateful tyrant should come.” So Chrysostom: “As Rome succeeded Greece, so Antichrist is to succeed Rome.”

This heathen imperial power *was swayed by, and centered in a series of single persons, the Caesars*—following one another in succession. History exactly corresponds to prophecy. When Constantine, the Roman Emperor, removed the seat of power from the seven-hilled city of Rome to Constantinople, then the restraint began to be removed which had prevented the Bishops of Rome from exercising temporal power or promulgating Anti-Christian claims. And when the last Western Caesar was forced to abdicate in A.D. 475, Rome ceased to be the “seat” of imperial secular power, and the Bishops of Rome began to put forward claims which exactly correspond with the predictions of Daniel, Paul, and the Apocalypse; for the restraint was *ek mesou*—“out of the way”—of the claimant to the seven-hilled city. As Cardinal Baronius (Annals, An., 324-30) admits, even during Constantine’s reign, the Bishops of Rome had amassed wealth, and before the end of the fourth century their wealth and splendor excited envy and wonder. Andreas (Bibl. P. Max., V., 623) asserts that “most of the ancient interpreters in the Church affirm that the Apocalyptic prophecies concerning Babylon regard Rome,” and that the Man of Sin, when he appears, “will be as Sovereign of Rome, and, in the opinion of some, in the Temple, or Church of God”—just as the earliest extant Commentary by Bishop Victorinus, in the third century, says: “The city of Babylon, that is, Rome; the City on seven hills, that is, Rome.”

Cardinals Bellarmine and Baronius admit that in the Apocalypse John “calls Rome Babylon,” and Bishop Bossuet likewise admits it. In the locality where prophecy places Antichrist, there history, with one accord, places the bishops of Rome—viz., in the city of Rome on the seven hills, in the capacity of successors of Caesar, not of Peter the Apostle.

#### **(j) History’s AGREEMENT WITH PROPHECY.**

And precisely at the period pointed to by prophecy, viz., on the removal of the Imperial power from the city of Rome, does history describe the rise into Anti-Christian power of the Bishops of Rome.

Dean Milman (“History of Latin Christianity,” Bk. iii., ch. iii.) said: “The foundation of Constantinople marks one of the great periods of change in the annals of the world. The removal of the seat of empire from Rome, . . . the absence of a secular competition, allowed the Papal authority to grow up, and develop its secret strength. By the side of the imperial power . . . constantly repressed in its slow but steady advancement to supremacy . . . The Pope . . . in any other city would in vain have asserted his descent from St. Peter.”

Gibbon (“Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,” ch. xlix.): “The same character was assumed, the same policy was adopted by the Italian, the Greek, or the Syrian, who ascended the Chair of St.

Peter; and, after the loss of her (Rome's) legions and provinces, the genius and fortune of the Popes *again restored* the supremacy of Rome."

Bishop Doyle, the Popish Controversialist ("Essay on the Catholic Claims," sect. 5): "The seeds of decay were growing in the Roman Empire when the seat of government was removed to Constantinople . . . and Rome . . . now stripped of nearly all her wealth and glory, looked upon her Prelate as the last stay of her power. . . ."

Abbé H. Lacordaire ("Lettre sur le Saint Siege, p. 29): "If you would trace the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See to its source, you shall find that it has been derived from four concurrent circumstances . . . first, the decline of the Eastern Empire, which could no longer defend Rome against the barbarians; secondly, the ambition of the Lombard Kings, who desired to subject it [Rome] to their crown; thirdly, the protection of two great men in succession, Pepin and Charlemagne; finally, the love (!) which all the inhabitants of Rome felt towards the Sovereign Pontiff."

Abbe Mably (Feller, in Art., Constantine): "It was determined by eternal (infernal?) interests, that Rome should henceforth have no other splendor than was derived from the Chair of her Pontiff."

Count Le Maistre ("Du Pape," Vol. I., p. 245): "While Rome was yet pagan, the Roman Pontiff bored the Caesars. The Emperors, who bore, amidst his titles, that of Sovereign Pontiff, could less endure a Pope than a competitor for his Empire. A hand unseen removed him from the Eternal City, to bestow it on the chief of the eternal (infernal?) Church. The same enclosure could not contain the Emperor and the Pontiff.

Mons. Masse ("Torts du Protestantisme envers les peuples"): "The choice of Byzantium by the first Christian Emperor permitted the Pontifical hierarchy to place above physical force a moral (!) power, distinct and separate, which displayed to all eyes its origin."

Abbé du Pradt ("Concordat de l'Amérique avec Rome," p. 70): "The removal of the Emperors to Constantinople gave rise to the greatness of the Popes."

Gibbon ("Decline and Fall," cxxi.) says that "the wealth and luxury of the Popes of the fourth century . . . represent the intermediate degree between the humble poverty of the Apostolic Fisherman and the Royal State of a Temporal Prince."

In the year A.D. 595 Bishop Gregory I. of Rome denounced the title "universal Bishop"—claimed by his rival, of Constantinople—as Antichristian. Somewhere between A.D. 606 and 610 Bishop Boniface III. of Rome assumed that very title, accepting it from the Eastern Emperor Phocas, who was a usurper, a murderer, and had degraded Cyriacus, Petrarch of Constantinople, for a virtuous deed. The effect of this title upon the minds of ecclesiastics was soon apparent. As Jerome says: "When that which is temporal claims eternity, this is a Name of blasphemy." Within forty years Theodore I., Bishop of Rome, assumed a fresh title, that of "Sovereign Pontiff." He was the last Bishop of Rome whom bishops dared to call "brother." A great and Antichristian change had manifestly been effected.\* The "man of the Apostasy" had "revealed" himself, in his self-exaltation and pride.

\* It is remarkable that 1,260 solar years, from A.D. 606-610, reach to the downfall (1870) of Papal territorial power; and 1,260 lunar years, from A.D. 646, reach to the Vatican Council of 1869, which proclaimed Papal Infallibility.

The exalted position now reached was inconsistent with dependence upon any earthly sovereign, so steps were taken to remove the custom that made the Bishop of Rome's "consecration" dependent



on the Roman Emperor's prior approval of his "election" as Bishop. In A.D. 683 *this restraint was removed* by an Edict of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus (Baronius, Epit. An. 684, i.).\* The Pope was now independent, ecclesiastically as well as temporally.

\*1,260 calendar years from A.D. 683 terminated in A.D. 1925; and in Solar years end in 1943. In Lunar years they ended in 1906.

Devastated by barbarians, who, ever since the fourth century, had ravaged the Roman Empire; deserted by its Sovereigns, Italy turned to the Popes, who, by force of circumstances, and by their own vaulting ambition, had become substituted for the Emperors—and so established the last form of headship over the Latin world, foretold of old.

#### POINT 1.

Examine now Cardinal Newman's words! He says, "While Apostles were on earth, there was the display of neither Bishop nor Pope" (p. 149, "Development, The Papacy.")

Compare verse 3 of the prophecy in 2 Thess. ii.: The Man of Sin was not revealed when Paul the Apostle wrote.

#### POINT 2.

The Man was to be "revealed in his own due time" (verse 6).

And Cardinal Newman says: "In course of time the power of the Pope displayed itself" (p. 149, same Vol.).

#### POINT 3.

There was something "withholding, or keeping back, the Man from appearing" in the first century (see verse 6).

And the Cardinal says: "The Imperial power, or Roman Empire, availed for keeping back the power of the Papacy" (p. 151)

#### POINT 4.

But was it generally admitted that the Empire's power was that which hindered, or delayed, the Man of Sin?

Cardinal Newman says: "The withholding power, mentioned in Thess. ii. 6, was the Roman Empire. I grant this, for all the ancient writers so speak of it" (p. 49, "Discussions"),

Compare verse 5: "I told you these things, and now ye know what it is that withholdeth."

#### POINT 5.

"Only let the withholding party be taken away, or removed, then shall that wicked be revealed" (verse 7).

And Cardinal Newman says: "When the Imperial power had been removed to Constantinople (800 miles away!) then the Roman See came into a position of sovereignty" (p. 271, "Historic Essays," Vol. ii.).

And again he says: "The Papacy began to form as soon as the Empire relaxed, . . . and further developments took place when that Empire fell" (p. 152, "Development").

Cardinal Newman says: “Pope Stephen VI. dragged the body of another Pontiff from the grave, cut off its head and three fingers, and threw it into the River Tiber. He himself was afterwards strangled in prison. Then the power of electing Popes fell into the hands of the licentious woman, Theodora, and her unprincipled daughters. One of these women advanced a lover, and another a son to the Popedom. The grandson, Octavian, ELEVATED himself to the Chair at eighteen, titled John XII.”

This is what Cardinal Newman tells us on p. 259 of his “Historic Essays”; and next page he says:—

“Pope John XII. was carried off by a blow received during his intrigues. Boniface VII. after his elevation, plundered the Church of St. Peter, and fled to Constantinople; Benedict IX. was Pope at twelve, and became notorious for adulteries and murders.

Such are a few of the most prominent features of Church History; when the world lay in wickedness, Simon the Sorcerer lording it over the Church, whose bishops and priests were given to fornication” (p. 260).

Cardinal Manning, “The Temporal Power,” p. 126; “The temporal power of the Supreme Pontiff was only in its beginning; but about the *seventh century* it was firmly established.” Page 16: “For 1,200 years the Bishops of Rome have reigned as temporal princes.” Page 127: “For these 1,200 years the peace . . . of Europe has been owing solely in its principle to this” (!). Page 182: “From that hour, which I might say was 1,500 years ago, or, to speak within limit, I will say was 1,200, the Supreme Pontiff has been a true and proper Sovereign.”

(Daniel vii. 25: “They shall be given into his hand, until a time, and times and half a time” i.e., three and a half times, or 1,260 years.)

### **(k) GRADUAL RISE INTO POWER.**

When first proclaimed in words only, the Papal system was repudiated by Gregory I.—as already stated. On that theory, the Pope has the *plenitude of Power*, all other bishops are only his servants and auxiliaries, from him all power is derived, and he is concurrent Ordinary in every diocese. So Gregory understood the title, “Ecumenical Patriarch,” and would not endure that so “wicked and blasphemous a title” should be given to himself or anyone else (Janus, “The Pope and the Council,” p. 84). But from the assumption of that “blasphemous title,” by Boniface III., right onwards to the promulgation of Papal Infallibility in 1870, the career of the Papacy has been one long, incessant, and ever-augmenting assumption of Antichristian “names of blasphemy,” and the putting forth of claims based on those names.

As there is no “let” or “hindrance” in existence, these claims continue to the present hour. **They endanger the peace of the world, because they involve the disruption of kingdoms, the overthrow of states, and the re-establishment —by force—of that Papal territorial power,** (emphasis mine) which in 1870 was rightly taken away from the Papacy by popular vote. These claims establish beyond the region of controversy, that the Papacy is the Antichrist, for they are as opposed to the Spirit of Christ as are the falsehoods, the forgeries and the pride on which they are based.

### **(l) FALSE BASIS AND SUPERSTRUCTURE.**

That the Papacy is the outcome of belief in a falsehood is shown by the prediction in 2 Thess. ii. 11: “for this cause (i.e., because they received not the love of the truth) God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe *The Lie—to pseudos*.”

What the Papacy is to-day is best described by an ex- Jesuit, Graf Paul Von Hoensbroech, for fourteen years a Jesuit priest, who, in his preface to “The Papacy in its influence upon Society and civilization,” says: “The Papacy . . . is the greatest, the most fatal and, at the same time, the most successful *system of error* to be found in the world’s history. The Papacy—that huge *error system* . . . ultramontanism is a perfectly organized system, high, dry, and broad, close-jointed, highly finished in every respect.”

In “Ultramontanism, its Bane and its Antidote,” he said: “Ultramontanism is a *Secular Political System* which, with and under the cloak of religion, arrogates to itself worldwide political and temporal power.”

In the former work he also says: “The Papacy, in its pretensions to be a Divine institution, deriving its existence from Christ . . . is surrounded with *thousands of lies* emanating from its defenders.”

Mr. J. M. Capes, in his “Reasons for Returning to the Church of England” (pp. 110-111), says: “A system which depends for success upon *falsification of history* is, ipso facto, a system which produces a disbelief in the value of clear and unflinching honesty of statement in the affairs of life. Accordingly, whenever the Roman ideas of Church government establish themselves, they bring with them the *spirit of intrigue*, and a *distaste for honest, unflinching truth-telling*.”

The Rev. E. S. Foulkes, once a Romish priest, says in his “Difficulties of the Day,” pp. 145-153: “Gradually the conviction dawned upon me that this wondrous system . . . as it exists in our day, was a colossal *Lie*; a gigantic fraud; a superhuman *imposture*; the most artistically contrived *take-in* for general credence, for specious appearances, ever palmed upon mankind.” ‘Where Satan works most, it is precisely there that he is most anxious to keep farthest out of sight. I say, then, of the Roman system, that it is an agglomeration of *lies*, reposing on a basis of truth.’”

In 1891 Leo XIII. delivered an Allocution to the Cardinals in Secret Consistory (“Tablet,” December 19th, 1891), in which he pretended that all sorts of “enemies” were “on every hand visible,” seeking to “assign boundaries to the spiritual power of the Pope, who holds it direct from God”\* – where observe *to pseudos*—The Lie. Upon this the “Standard” of December 17th, 1891, very properly commented by pointing out *its falsity*: “When Leo XIII. bewails the limitations on *his spiritual kingdom*, he either says the thing that is not, . . . or, he is really betaking himself to lamentation because he cannot extend his spiritual kingdom, and wield . . . the temporal arm in vindication of it. If this claim means anything at all, it implies a *demand to be empowered to suppress heresy, and therefore to resort to persecution*.”

\* In his Encyclical “De Unitate,” Leo XIII, said: “What Jesus Christ had said of Himself, we may truly repeat of ourselves.”

“At the bottom of these recurring Papal jeremiads (a speech or literary work expressing a bitter lament) is the unwillingness of the Papacy to resign itself to the loss of temporal sovereignty, and the settled resolve to go on agitating for its recovery by all the means and all the expedients at its disposal.”

Here the “Standard” most correctly exposes the Papal falsehood, which represents the Italians as its “enemies,” because they oppose its evil demands and claims to use force. As this paper pointed out: “in other words, the Pope’s Allocution, which is ostensibly a spiritual utterance, is a political manifesto.’ That is, it is a *Lie*.”

The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, in his “Rome: Newest Fashions in Religion,” showed incontestably from Papal Documents, from the “Syllabus” and “Encyclical” of 1864, and from the “Speeches” of Pius IX., that the claims of the Pope are a series of violent tirades and political harangues disguised as religious utterances, all having for their object the restoration of Papal territorial power, in order to possess the means of enforcing the Papal Will, and of suppressing all opposition by force. The mendacity accompanying these utterances is fully set forth by Mr. Gladstone, himself an expert in the art of “*camouflage*.” No more conspicuous an example of the prevailing falsehood of Papal remarks can be conceived than Pius IX.’s description of the atrocious Kingdom of Bomba (this seems to be referring to Sicily. See: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand\\_II\\_of\\_the\\_Two\\_Sicilies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand_II_of_the_Two_Sicilies)), as a Kingdom of “repose and tranquility,” for which he “prays,” a “Kingdom of peace and prosperity.” As Mr. Gladstone indignantly observed: “This is the language in which the Pope is not ashamed to speak of a Government founded upon the most gross and abominable perjury, cruel and base in all its details to the last degree.”\*

\*Archbishop Bagshawe did not hesitate to say: “There is no Christianity outside of the Catholic Church”; so also states Pius X.’s Catechism, thus placing Christianity inside a colossal lie.

### **(m) FALSEHOODS.**

The language of falsehood is inseparable from the Popedom. This falsehood is manifested in every sort of way; in the description of the Pope as “the Lamb of the Vatican,” for example: “The Living Christ,” “The Vicar of Christ,” “The Most Holy Lord,” “His Holiness,” “Our Father,” et cetera; as well as in the forgeries so ably exposed by the learned Dr. Dollinger, in his “The Pope and the Council,” viz., the Isidorian Decretals of the ninth century; that “huge fabrication”; the Hildebrandine Forgeries of the eleventh century, which used the Isidorian forgeries to further Papal Absolutism; the “earlier Roman forgeries” towards the end of the fifth and beginning of sixth centuries, when “the compilation of spurious acts of Roman martyrs” began, and was “continued for some centuries.” These forgeries included “the fabulous story of the conversion and baptism of Constantine, invented to glorify the Church of Rome, and make Pope Sylvester appear a worker of miracles.” “Then the inviolability of the Pope had to be established, and the principle that he cannot be judged by any human tribunal.” Towards the end of the sixth century a fabrication was undertaken in Rome, the full effect of which did not appear till long afterwards, viz., the interpolation of a falsehood in Cyprian’s book on the unity of the Church, which represented Cyprian as teaching that “the Church is built on the Chair of St. Peter.” An old catalog of Roman bishops was interpolated for an ulterior object, afterwards carried out in the “Liber Pontificalis.” “It is the first edition of 530, which is chiefly to be reckoned as a deliberate forgery, and an important link in the chain of Roman inventions and interpolations.”\*

\*Hallam’s “View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages,” 1869, p. 348, says: “Upon these spurious decretals was built the great fabric of Papal supremacy over the different national Churches . . . the imposture is too palpable.”

About the middle of the eighth century, the famous “Donation of Constantine” was concocted at Rome, based on the earlier fifth century legend, whereby the Pope is described as lord and Master of all Bishops, and having authority over the four “thrones” of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Jerusalem; and as having received Italy and the Western Provinces from the Emperor. It is upon this forgery that the Pope’s claim to territorial power rests. The earliest reference to this pretended gift of Constantine occurs in Pope Adrian’s letter to Charlemagne in A.D. 777; though Popes had, since A.D. 752, spoken of “restitution” of Italian towns and provinces to St. Peter or to the Roman

Republic. As Dollinger remarks: "Such language first became intelligible when the [forged] 'Donation of Constantine' was brought forward to show that the Pope was the rightful possessor, as *heir of the Roman Caesars* in Italy...."

"Twenty years later, the need was felt at Rome of a more extensive invention. So a document was laid before Charlemagne in Rome, professing to be his father Pepin's "gift" or promise of territory to the Pope. This forgery assigned all Corsica, Venetia, Istria, Luni, Moselica, Parma, Reggio, Mantua, and the Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, and the Exarchate of Ravenna ("Liber Pontificalis," ii., 193, Edition Vignol).

There have unquestionably been some falsifications in privileges granted to Popes by Emperors later than Charlemagne—such as the "pact" of Louis the Pious, in A.D. 817—an interpolation of the eleventh century. So, again, with the privileges of the Emperors, Otho I., in 962, and Henry II. in 1020. All kinds of other forgeries are traceable to Rome. As "Acts of Martyrs" had been fabricated there earlier, so from the tenth century, false documents were fabricated wholesale at Rome ("Le Grotte Vaticane, Roma, 1639," pp. 505-510; Jaffé, "Regesta," p. 936).

The most potent instrument of Papal machination was Gratian's "Decretum," issued in the twelfth century, from Bologna. In this the Isidorian forgeries were combined with other Gregorian writers' fabrications, as well as with Gratian's own. This work displaced all older collections of Canon Law, and became the fount of knowledge for all "scholastic theologians"! Forgery was herein added to forgery—all alike enhancing the claims of the Papacy.

About A.D. 1570 this compilation of falsehoods was "corrected," at the desire of the Pope; yet to-day it forms the Codex for all canonical authority! For instance, the false principles that the Pope is superior to Law, and that all Church property is his, that clerics are exempt from civil law by Divine ordinance.

#### **(n) FALSIFICATION OF SCRIPTURE.**

Not only so, but texts of Scripture have been *deliberately falsified* in furtherance of Papal aims. Thus Innocent III. (1198-1216) altered Deuteronomy xvii. 12 in the Vulgate, as to mean whoever does not submit to the decision of the High Priest (whose place the Pope claims to hold) is to be killed ("Decret. per Venerabilem," "Qui filii sint legitimi," 4,17). Pope Leo X. quoted the text as corrupted, in a Bull, giving a *false reference* to the Book of Kings instead of Deuteronomy, to prove that whoever disobeyed the Pope must be put to death (Pastor Aeternus, Hardouin, Concil., IX. 1826).

In the thirteenth century, a new fabrication appeared, affecting dogmatic theology and education. It is known as the "Dominican Forgeries," because composed by a Dominican monk, who concocted a catena of spurious passages from Greek Councils and Fathers. They professed to be eight hundred years old, and were at once used by Pope Urban IV. to prove that the "Apostolic Throne" is the sole authority in doctrinal matters (Raynaldus, Annal. Ann., 1263, 61). Urban sent the document to Aquinas, who knew no Greek, and from the Latin translation made by Buonaccursia, the Dominican, invented the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. One of his phrases was: "Christ is fully and completely with every Pope in sacrament and authority." Thus on the basis of fabrication by a Dominican monk, Aquinas built up his Popedom, which ever since has put forth its blasphemous claims of Infallibility and Absolutism.

Lord Acton, Regius Professor of History at Cambridge, a Roman Catholic, said: “The passage from the Catholicism of the Fathers to that of the modern Popes was accomplished by willful falsehood; and the whole structure of traditions, laws, and doctrines that support the theory of infallibility and the practical despotism of the Popes, stands on a basis of fraud” (“North British Review,” October, 1869, p. 130).\*

\*In a letter to Mr. Gladstone quoted at p. lv. of Mr. H. Paul’s Introductory Memoir to Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone he said: It not-only promotes, it inculcates distinct mendacity and deceitfulness. In certain cases it is made a duty to lie.”

John Henry Shorthouse (author of John Inglesant) said: “The Papal Curia is founded upon falsehood, and falsehood enters, consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, into the soul of every creature that comes under its influence.” (Preface to Rev. A. Galton’s “Message & Position of the Church of England,” 1899, pp. 13-14.)

Leo XIII., by a special “Encyclical on Scholastic Philosophy,” urged that Aquinas’s teaching should be used in all schools and seminaries; so that *Falsifications* of history permeate the entire curriculum of scholastic education in the Popedom. The entire system is based on a *Lie*, the lie that the Apostle Peter was “Prince of the Apostles” and “Bishop of Rome,” and that his successors are “Vicars of Christ.” It is permeated through and through with lies, which are known to be such, but are deliberately utilized to bolster up false claims. No more evident identification can be afforded than this, that the very names the Popes assumed are false from beginning to end.

#### **(o) THE TITLES OF THE POPES ALL FALSE.**

To the end of the fourth century they called themselves “Vicars of Peter,” but since the fifth, “Vicars of Christ” — the former title being as false as the latter, though not so blasphemous. The name “Pope,” or Father, was in A.D. 500 “appropriated to the Roman Pontiff (Gibbon, vii., 37), it having formerly been the title of all bishops alike. Tertullian, in one of his Treatises, speaks of the Roman bishop in his own time calling himself by the heathen title, “Pontifex Maximus,” as well as “Episcopus Episcoporum.” Cyprian and Augustine both rejected the false claim of the Bishop of Rome in regard to Christ’s statement: “Thou art Peter, and on thee I will build My Church”; but the Bishop of Rome undeviatingly claimed the Primacy because Rome was “the See of the Prince of the Apostles,” a wholly mendacious claim based on falsehood. To maintain this, the Acts of Nicene Council were falsified (Hardouin, i., 469-485), and other Forgeries of Councils were made in support.

But it is decisively and distinctively the false title, “Vicar of Christ,” that emphatically establishes the Papacy as the “Antichrist.” This title was given by a Roman Council to Gelasius, Bishop of Rome, 5th century: “We behold in thee Christ’s Vicar” (Hardouin, ii., 946, 947).\*

\* Cardinal Bellarmine, in his Treatise on the Roman Pontiff (De Rom. Pont. Lib. ii. Cap. XXXI., Ingoldstadt, 1839), said: “Pope: Father of Fathers; the Pontiff of Christians, High Priest, the Vicar of Christ, the Head of the Body, that is of the Church, the foundation of the building of the Church; the Father and Doctor of the faithful; the Ruler of the House of God; the Keeper of God’s Vineyard; the Bridegroom of the Church; the Ruler of the Apostolic See; the Universal Bishop.”

And in his “De Conciliorum Auctoritate Lib. ii, Cap. XVII.” “All the names which are given in the Scriptures to Christ (where it appears that He is superior to the Church)—all these names are given to the Pope.”

## **(p) “WAR WITH THE SAINTS.”**

The general principle by which Popery is governed is thus laid down by some of its authorized organs: “We are the children of a Church which *has ever* avowed the deepest hostility to the principles of ‘religious liberty.’ If it would benefit Catholicism, he (the Papist) would tolerate you; if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly, even, he might hang you . . .” (“Rambler,” September, 1851).

“Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds. It is intolerance itself ” (Ibid).

Cardinal Manning (“Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects”) stated: “The Holy See is ultramontane, the whole Episcopate is ultramontane, the whole priesthood, the whole body of the Faithful throughout all nations . . . all are ultramontanes. Ultra- montanism is Popery, and Popery is Catholicism.”

Count Montalembert (Letter, dated Paris, February 28th, 1870) cited the Archbishop of Paris as saying: “The new ultramontane school leads to a double idolatry—the idolatry of the temporal power, and of the spiritual power. The new ultramontanes . . . have abounded in hostile arguments against all liberties”; and Dr. Dollinger (“The Pope and the Council”) declared that “Ultramontanism, then, is essentially Papalism,” or, as Montalembert expressed it, “Absolutism of Rome.”

Now this shows not only the general principle that governs Popery in its relationship to Protestantism or Religious Liberty, but also the fact that, given an opportunity, it would enforce, as of yore, that principle, by the same means it adopted “in the good old days.”

It is therefore important to know precisely what those means were, and how it used them in the plenitude of its power. As shown elsewhere, the Notes on Matthew xiii. 29 (which have been incorporated in a class-book for use at Maynooth, entitled “Menochis”) teach that “heretics” may lawfully and properly be put to death, as common malefactors (see also Douai Bible, Coyne, Dublin, 1816); and “by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, may and ought to be chastised or executed.” The Romish Archbishops, who authorized these Notes, were well aware of the meaning of their teaching, and were well acquainted with the history of the past, i.e. of the Persecutions and Crusades, the Massacres and the Dragonnades, whereby millions of Christians were slaughtered and put to death, by every form of cruelty, from the twelfth to the eighteenth century. They were not speaking at random, or inculcating empty formula. Ranke’s “History of the Popes” tells us that these “Crusaders” boasted: “We have spared neither age nor sex; we have smitten everyone with the edge of the sword” (I., 32).

The “War with the Saints” predicted in Daniel vii. 25; Rev. xi. 7, xiii. 7, as made by “the Beast,” commenced in a general way, under Pope Alexander III.’s Council at Tours, A.D. 1163, which denounced the Bible-reading Albigenses as “heretics,” prohibited buying from or selling to them, and proscribed them. This was followed by the Decree of the Third Lateran Council, A.D. 1179, under the same Pope, against all so-called “heretics,” refusing them Christian burial, and forbidding any to harbor them. In A.D. 1183 Pope Lucius III. issued a Bull against “heretics” of every sort, and ordering the “*Inquisition*” to suppress them. In 1198 Innocent III. wrote Epistles to various Prelates, charging them to extirpate “heresy,” and to employ the arms of princes and people. He then sent “Legates” as *Inquisitors* to Toulouse, and not long afterwards proclaimed a “Crusade” against the “heretics.”

The third Canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, in A.D. 1215, urged more zeal in the extirpation of heresy, the secular powers being expressly enjoined to carry out the behests of the ecclesiastic, vassals being absolved from allegiance to any prince who refused, and crusaders being rewarded like Crusaders in the Holy Land. In A.D. 1227 the Council of Narbonne followed on the same lines, and then that of Toulouse, in which children were compelled to denounce parents as heretics, and the Scriptures were forbidden to the laity. Council after Council on the same lines followed, up to Gregory IX.'s ferocious Bull in a.d. 1236. The fact of the commencement of this Papal War against Christians is strongly marked in History, even as the Jesuit Gretzer, in his "*Prolegomena, induciae Tudensis succedaneos*," admits. It was a Papal war of extermination of all witnesses for Jesus, and leveled against Holy Scriptures.

The same spirit and procedure were manifested in England from 1360 to 1380 against Wyclif and his followers, and in Bohemia—some forty years later—against Huss and Jerome; furious "war" being waged against individuals, such as Savonarola, in Italy, from 1464 to 1498, as well as elsewhere against Bohemians, Waldenses, Taborites and United Brethren. Popes and Councils, priests and people all joined in this "war," and racks and gibbets, fire and sword were deemed fit weapons against Christians. The story of the murder of the Waldenses under Pope Innocent VIII., and of the Christians of Val Louise in High Dauphiny, is a recital of atrocities calculated to make one's blood curdle. In 1478 the Inquisition was "reformed," so as to become more efficacious as an instrument of persecution and murder. Llorente, the historian of this "reformed" Inquisition, computes that between 1478 and 1517, 13,000 persons *were burnt alive*, and 169,000 tortured. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Papal War with the saints had succeeded in reducing them to silence by means of fire, sword, torture and persecution.

During the sixteenth century the Reformation took place, and, in order to stamp it out, the Papacy summoned the Council of Trent, which continued its labors from 1545 to 1563, ending with a unanimous shout of "Anathema to Heretics," having decreed all sorts of decrees and canons, all containing curses upon anyone who refused to accept their unscriptural teaching. Session XXV. decreed that every clause and word enacted by that Council, under Popes Paul III., Julius III. and Pius IV. established "*the authority of the Apostolic See always inviolate*." In other words, all that was ever enacted as Papal Law or claimed as the authority of the Pope is ever enduring and unchangeable. Every barbarous enactment against "Heretics," every power and privilege to break oaths, and to dispense from law, or to absolve subjects from loyalty, everything in Rome's Canon Law still remains in force *today*.

In A.D. 1572 took place St. Bartholomew's massacre, and in A.D. 1588 the Spanish Armada, both of them phases of the "war against the saints," followed by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 1685, and the Dragonnades, which caused such misery to the French Huguenots. In Ireland there took place the fiendish atrocities, in 1640-42, of the Irish massacre of Protestants; whilst in Scotland the Protestant Covenanters suffered every kind of persecution and martyrdom. During Mary's short reign of five years, no less than some three hundred British martyrs were burnt at the stake; the Gunpowder Plot, and other seditious movements, leading up to the English Rebellion and overthrow of the Stuart dynasty, all being but phases of this incessant "war" on the part of Rome—against liberty, Bible truth, and the "saints" or witnesses for Christ, i.e., Protestants.

The Revelations of the Italian Revolution in Rome in 1848, when the Inquisition buildings were broken open, show incontestably the late date on which this murderous institution—an institution established wholly by the Church of Rome under Papal sanction—was at -work, in this terrible



“war”; a war waged all over the world to the present hour, as Missionary Societies’ reports unceasingly testify.

Such is a mere sketch of a long-enduring and remorseless “war,” as recorded in history. It is the due fulfillment of Prophecy. If we enter into particulars, the case becomes still more conclusive against Rome, as it shows that no system that has ever existed has such a record of murder and inquisitorial cruelty towards Christians. Neither Pagan Rome nor Mohammedanism can compare with the record of Papal Rome. It is “*facile princeps*,” (Latin meaning easily the first or best) and unique in that respect, as its “war” has been ever waged against Christians because of their faith in Christ, and belief in Holy Writ.

The following list, by no means exhaustive, affords an insight into this War with the Saints, i.e., with Christians whom Rome “hates.”

The third Canon of fourth Council of Lateran, A.D., 1215, under Pope Innocent III., decreed the Extermination of Heretics (*Corpus Juris Canonici*, Decret., Greg. IX. V., and tit. vii., cap. 13, de Hereticis). This, we are duly informed By the “English Catholics” (who in 1882 published their “Records,” “Edited by the Fathers of the Congregation of the London Oratory, with an Historical Introduction by Thomas F. Knox, D.D., priest of the same Congregation,” Vol. II., p. xxvii.), was “the common law of medieval Christendom”; and, “by its insertion in the *Corpus Juris*, became part of the *ordinary Statute Law of the Church*.” It was acted on by Pope Pius V., “when he issued his Bull, deposing Queen Elizabeth,” and is today in force in Ireland.

The “Constitution” of Pope Clement V., in the Council of Vienna, A.D. 1316, orders all Bishops and Inquisitors to arrest, or seize, in iron fetters or handcuffs, all suspected heretics, and to consign them to prison to undergo inquisition.

Lord Acton, Regius Professor of History, said (“Times,” November 9th, 1874): “A Pope who lived in Catholic times, and who is famous in history as the author of the last Crusade, decided that it is no murder to kill excommunicated persons. *This rule was incorporated in the Canon Law*. During the revision of the Code, which took place in the sixteenth century, the passage was allowed to stand. It has been for seven hundred years, and *continues* to be, part of the Ecclesiastical Law.”

In 1892 the English Jesuits published a book called “*Aquinas Ethicus*,” with Notes by Joseph Rickaby, S.J., in which we read (Vol. I., p. 333): “On their [heretics’] side is the sin whereby they have deserved, not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, but also to be banished from the world by death. Hence, if coiners or other malefactors are at once handed over by secular princes to a just death, much more may heretics, immediately they are convicted of heresy, be not only excommunicated, but also justly done to die.”

This medieval doctrine, republished thus by modern Jesuits, was specially commended by Pope Leo XIII. in his “*Encyclical on Scholastic Philosophy*”—and is therefore regarded as *de Fide* (held as an obligatory article of faith) by Papists. It is taught in all seminaries.

This same Pope, in his Letter on “The Rosary” (“Tablet,” October 1st, 1887), styled the Massacres of the Albigenses and other “heretics,” “great triumphs,” “glories,” “marvels,” “magnificent examples of piety” to be emulated by modern Papists. Further, he gave his special “blessing” to two volumes on “Public Ecclesiastical Law,” published . at Rome in 1900-1, by Marianus de Luca, S.J., Professor of Canon Law, in which work it is taught that “heresy must be rooted out with fire and sword” (Vol. I., p. 147); that “the Church can inflict on heretics the penalty of death” (p. 145), and

that when once “the Church has pronounced sentence the civil rulers are bound to carry out the sentence” (p. 146).\*

\*The New Zealand “Sentinel,” October,- 1923, P. 8, contained a “Felonious Record of Knights of Columbus” in the United States since 1913. It included two murderous assaults on ex-priest Crowley in 1913, and on 14 other ministers and Protestants.

A more recent work by Alexius M. Lepicier, Professor of Theology in the College de Propaganda Fide, published in 1910, and entitled “De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatii,” teaches that “heretics” are to be put an end to, and explains that men who oppose “the Church,” and are killed, are not “martyrs,” but criminals (pp. 271-6).

F. Hugh O’Donnell, ex-M.P. for Dungarvan, in his “The Ruin of Irish Education,” describes how scholars in Romish schools are taught to hate “heretics.” They are told that “instead of being educated, heretics ought to be slaughtered, and that the slaughtering of them is a mark of the perfection of the Catholic Church” (p. 173). He shows that “civil society is bound to kill heretics when ordered by the Catholic Church” (p. 175).

In order to remove any doubt as to what is meant—in all these murderous and intolerant edicts and works—by the word “heretics,” Pope Pius X. most considerately published, in 1906, at the Vatican Press in Rome, a “Compendium of Christian Doctrine,” which conveys the following information: “Heretics are the baptized, who pertinaciously refuse to believe some truth revealed by God and taught as of faith by the Catholic Church, for example . . . *the various sects of Protestants*” (p. 131); and in p. 398: “*Protestantism or the Reformed religion. . . is the sum of all heresies, which existed before it, which have since arisen, and which can still arise to destroy souls,*” “the most monstrous congeries of private and individual errors, embraces all heresies, and represents all the forms of *rebellion against the holy Catholic Church.*”

Now, there is no such sin, in the eyes of “the Church,” as ‘rebellion’ against itself; and on p. 399 the Catechism explains that “the Protestant spirit” is “subversive of Faith, of morals, and of all authority Divine and human.”



Medal struck by order of the Popes to commemorate the bloody massacre of St. Bartholomew.

Woe, therefore, betide the “Protestant” who, in the day of Rome’s power, falls into its blood-stained hands! As the Romish organ, “The Rambler,” in September, 1851, honestly confessed: “Believe us not, Protestants of England and Ireland, when you hear us pouring forth our liberalisms—they mean nothing. Such a person is not talking Catholicism. . . If he were lord in the land, and you in the minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would he do to you? If expedient he would imprison you, banish you, fine you, possibly he might hang you . . . but he would never tolerate you.” Nor must the confiding and unsuspecting Protestant hug to his bosom the delusion that friendship, or relationship, or business connection, or any other social inter-communion with Papists, would exempt the Protestant from persecution or slaughter in the day of Rome’s power.

At the risk of prolixity and tediousness, it is necessary to insist on the extreme danger that awaits Protestants today, if they permit Rome to become once more supreme in Great Britain or in Ireland; for Rome is engaged in “war with the saints” It is a war, *à l’outrance* (to excess). So long as “heresy” exists, so long will Rome’s murderous doctrines be enforced. Hence, it is not a waste of time to reiterate certain facts.

(1) It is the duty of every Popish priest to “unsparingly denounce” “heresy”; and Popish bishops are the Chief Inquisitors in their diocese; and, if they took the Episcopal oath out of Great Britain, were, at their “consecration,” obliged to swear: “The rights, honors, privileges and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his successors, I shall give all diligence to preserve, defend, advance, and promote . . . Heretics, schismatics, and rebels against the same our Lord, and his successors, I will persecute and fight against, to the utmost of my power” (Pontificale Romanum, “De Consecratione Electi in Episcopum,”” p. 79, Forma Juramenti). Irish bishops probably take it.

(2) “If they took the oath out of Great Britain,” for, in consequence of the outcry in 1850 against this exterminating oath, the clause commencing “Heretics,” and ending “power,” has been omitted in this country. But there is nothing whatever to prevent a Popish bishop being “consecrated” elsewhere, and so evade the understanding that in Great Britain that part of the oath shall *not* be taken. If consecrated at Rome, for instance, the entire oath is enforced. The Latin of this part of the oath is: “Hereticos, Schismaticos, et Rebelles eidem Domina nostro . . . pro posse persequar et impugnabo.” It is important to note that desperate efforts are made in this country to deny that “Persequar” means “persecute.” This will not deceive anyone acquainted with Romish duplicity. For that very Latin word is systematically used in Roman versions of the Bible to denote persecution; for instance, it appears in the Vulgate of Sixtus V. and Clement VIII., in Psalm cix. 16, Acts ix. 4, and xxii. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 15, etc., along with its cognates.

(3) Once every four years Popish bishops from England and Ireland are obliged to appear personally at Rome to render an account of their stewardship to the Pope. No one but an ignoramus would believe that the Pope would omit then to ask if that particular part of the oath (whether taken in Rome or ostentatiously omitted in England for politic purposes, and with “mental restriction”) has been kept, for the rooting out of “heresy” is the chief business of all Popish bishops, who, by their oaths, are constituted Inquisitors-general of their dioceses, and are bound “in all things to render faith, subjection, and obedience” to the Pope. Session XXIV. of the Council of Trent expressly constitutes Popish bishops Inquisitors, with power to “punish,” to “visit,” and to “correct” “in accordance with the enactments of the Canon.”; and Session XXV. ordered all bishops to “publicly express their detestation of and to anathematize all the heresies that have been condemned by the sacred Canons and General Councils.”

(4) But not “heresies” alone are to be anathematized; on the contrary, Session XXV. expressly orders bishops to excommunicate “*heretics*,” to fine them, to distrain upon property, to “smite them with the sword of anathema,” to order a boycott by the “faithful,” and to “proceed against them as suspected of heresy.” (“Decree of Reformation,” ch. III.). And, in order to show what Rome’s attitude to all “heretics” is, the entire Council of Trent, at its close, shouted aloud, “*Anathema to all Heretics*.”

(5) Has that attitude in any way changed? On the contrary; as already shown, there have recently appeared important Popish works issued by Papal authority, which expressly denounce “heresy” as the greatest of all crimes, and teach the “right,” as well as the “duty,” of “the Church,” to extirpate all heretics by death—even by fire if necessary. And, in order to make mistakes impossible, the late Pope authoritatively issued a Catechism, which explains that *all Protestants* are “heretics.”

Here are a few more evidences:—

(a) “Le Christianisme au some siècle,” of May 17th, 1917, reported a sermon preached in Notre Dame, Paris, during Lent, to a congregation of some 4,000 persons, in which the preacher said: “The Church may punish heretics. . . . They are culprits . . . they are in revolt against the infallible authority . . . they disseminate their perversity and corrupt other souls. The Church has, therefore, the right to subdue their diabolical depravity, not only by anathema, but by the sword, that is to say, by obtaining from Catholic States the suppression of heretics by penalties which may extend to death.”

(b) Archbishop Ryan, who died in 1911, said in his periodical, “The Shepherd of the Valley,” “The Church tolerates heretics when she is obliged to do so, but she hates them with a deadly hatred, and uses all her power to annihilate them. If ever the Catholics in this land should become a considerable majority, then will religious freedom come to an end.”

(c) The “Catholic Encyclopedia” declares that “the non-Catholic Christians of our day are, strictly speaking, her subjects.”

(d) Archbishop Troy’s Edition of the Latin Vulgate, published in Dublin by R. Coyne, says, in a Note to Matt. xiii. 25: “The good must tolerate the evil when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger otherwise when ill men (be they heretics or other malefactors) may be punished or suppressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and ought, by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or executed.” To 2 John v. 10, a Note is appended, declaring that if persons be “by name excommunicated, or declared to be heretics, yet even in worldly conversation and secular acts of life we must avoid them . . .”; i.e., we must boycott them!

To Rev. xvii. 6 the Note says: “When Rome puts heretics to death, and allows their punishments in other countries, their blood is not called the blood of saints, no more than the blood of thieves, man-killers and other malefactors. . . .”

(e) Pope Pius IX., writing to the German Emperor on August 7th, 1873, said: “Everyone who has been baptized belongs . . . to the Pope.”

Rev. T. Slater, in “A Manual of Moral Theology for English-speaking Countries,” with the Imprimatur of Cardinal Farley, dated 1907 {Vol. i., p. 93} says: “Men become subject to the Church

by Christian baptism . . . Heretics and schismatics, who are validly baptized, are, *per se*, subject to the Church's laws."

Edmund J. O'Reilly, S.J., Professor of Theology at Maynooth, in "The Relations of the Church to Society," says that the principle of religious toleration "is one which is not, and never has been and never will be, approved by the Church," whilst a war to re-establish Papal temporal power would be just—so far as the cause is concerned."

The Rev. T. Gilmartin, Professor at Maynooth, in his "Manual of Church History" (Vol. II., p. 228, Dublin, 1892), said: "The Church can punish heresy as an evil in itself, and as an offense against the Church, and the Church can require the assistance of the State in suppressing heresy."

In 1887 Pope Leo XIII. published a Brief, proffering "Indulgences" "for the extirpation of heresies," and that same year a Romish paper, in Mexico—the "Defensa Catolica"—said of a "heretic": "True charity consists . . . in taking his life, always supposing it is done for love of God. In the Lord's service, and for love of Him, we *must* . . . kill them"; whilst, in that same year, another Romish paper, the "Freeman's Journal," of New York, said: "If the killing of a few [Protestant] missionaries—we should almost . . . be inclined to say—'on with the dance; let joy be unconfined.'"

Whence the inference is obvious—that the penalty of death would be joyfully inflicted on Protestants, if the opportunity were afforded either by the subservience of the State, or by the increase of Popery.

#### (q) THE "CONSUMPTION" OF ANTICHRIST.

Some of the worst vagaries of Futurists would be avoided if they would but remember that prophetic periods of time are sure to be proportionate to the thing predicted, and commensurate with the importance attached by the Word of God to the subject of the prophecy. Moreover, they should remember that the progress of time, and the history of certain evils, are certain to be regulated by certain "Laws," resembling what are euphemistically styled "Nature's Laws"; for they are neither fortuitous nor without control by the arbiter of destiny. On the contrary, being, as they undoubtedly are, the result of Divine prescience, wisdom, and over-ruling Providence, they are assuredly under the control of the God of Nature—who works by Laws, not by chance.

That being so, students of the "more sure word of prophecy" must have regard to the "Laws of Nature" in regard to the evolution of history, and of prophetic periods connected with great events. It is wise to assume that there is analogy between the course of certain conspicuous evils in history, and the course of objects governed by certain well-known "Laws of Nature."

One such well-known Law is that a projectile does not reach its highest point in flight at the end of its trajectory through the atmosphere, but at a point somewhere about two-thirds of its trajectory, because it is constantly acted upon by the resistance of the air, the force of gravity, and decrease in muzzle velocity, all these being forces controlled by the "Laws of Nature."

Now, the Inspired Page plainly describes the History of Apostasy as corresponding to the flight of a projectile ejected out of "the abyss" (Rev. xi. 7; xvii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 8, 9) by Satan, and rising to its culmination when Christ's faithful witnesses have reached the summit of their testimony. (Rev. xi. 7; xii. 17; xiii. 7) Its culminating point is not to be sought at the end of its course, but rather some two-thirds of its distance from its "start." And, necessarily, like a projectile, its descent would be more rapid than its ascent to power. It is a grave mistake, therefore, on the part of Futurists to

represent Antichrist as emerging from obscurity at the end of History, in order at once to culminate, its greatest power being at the end of its career, a brief career of three and a half literal years, a period of time wholly out of proportion to the circumstances of the case, and quite incommensurate with the evil foreshadowed.

The Word of God makes it sufficiently obvious that the period in the history of “The Apostasy,” which corresponds to the gradual rise of a projectile, occupies the greater part of the history of Christendom; whilst the period corresponding to the more rapid descent of a projectile, occupies the briefer portion of the history of Christendom; its last third, in fact.

Hence, if the history of Christendom began at the era of our Lord’s First Advent in the first century; and if 2,520, or seven “times,” be the length of the “times of the Gentiles,” measured from Nebuchadnezzar’s days—B.C. 606-563, or some 630 years previously; then the history of Christendom falls within a period approximately 1,890 years in length, measured from A.D. 25-68, and the history of “The Apostasy” occupies the whole of that period, the last one-third being a period of decadence for Antichrist, whilst the first two-thirds comprise the story of his rise into power, and the growth of “The Apostasy.”

Singularly enough, two-thirds of 1,890 years are 1,260 years, i.e., the period assigned in prophecy to Antichrist’s career, measured from his “revelation” or parousia. 1,260 years from A.D. 25-68 extend to A.D. 1285-1328.

Antichrist’s career, therefore, may be regarded as consisting of two portions: firstly, the story of its rise into power between the first century and the fourteenth century; and, secondly, the story of its decline from power during the 630 years between the fourteenth century (A.D. 1285-1328) and the close of Christendom’s story—in the twentieth century.

Or, in other words, we are to look in history for the acme of Papal power in the interval between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries; and we must expect to observe its subsequent decline from power ever since.

Do these deductions agree with the facts of history? Nothing can be more certain than the fact that the meridian of Papal autocratic power was the period between A.D. 1215 and 1294—during the Pontificates of Innocent III., Honorius III., Gregory IX., Celestin IV., Innocent IV., Alexander IV., Urban IV., Clement IV., Gregory X., Innocent V., Adrian V., John XX., Nicholas III., Martin IV., Honorius IV., Nicholas IV., Celestin V., Boniface VIII., during which period superstition was at its height; the Crusades were in progress; the Inquisition was in full play; “heretics” were relentlessly persecuted; the Jews were brutally ill-treated; and imperious temporal, as well as spiritual, claims over princes and people were enforced by Popes. Historians, such as the Jesuit Bower, Ranke, Gibbon, Hallam, Arnold, Milman, with one consent point to this period as the noontide of Papal dominion. Italian authors fix on Gregory VII. to Innocent III.

But what does history say in regard to the subsequent period, since the fifteenth century? Has it proved to be a period of decline more rapid than the previous rise of Popery into power? Prophecy foretold that “the mystery of iniquity” was already at work in Paul’s days-A.D. 54; that it was to produce “The Apostasy” (2 Thess. ii. 3) before “the Son of Perdition” could be “revealed”; that his career was to last 1,260 years *after* his revelation; and that the whole period of Christendom’s history was to be 1,890 years from some point in the first century. This leaves rather less than 600 years for Antichrist’s decadence; his predicted “consumption” (2 Thess. ii. 8) by the Spirit of the Lord’s mouth—a “consumption” apparently twofold in character—for Daniel ascribes loss of

“dominion” (Dan. vii. 26) to it, whilst Paul seemingly refers to religious enfeeblement, and Zechariah (Zech. xi. 17) apparently predicts territorial loss as well as spiritual darkness. The Apocalypse (Rev. xvi. 10; xvii. 16) seems to hint at the same judgments, towards the end of Antichrist’s career.

Hence, it is sufficiently clear that the last six hundred years of the Papacy and Church of Rome were to be marked by rapidly augmenting spiritual darkness and territorial decay. Does history correspond to this statement? Nothing can be more certain than the fact that from the fifteenth century onwards to the present time the Papacy has experienced tremendous losses, both of territory and of subjects—for whereas in the fifteenth century the voice of Christendom was hushed, and Popery alone was regnant, the Reformation of the sixteenth century burst the shackles and fetters of Popery, threw the Light of Holy Writ upon its errors, and produced the most enlightened and progressive nations—the Protestant races of the world. Humiliation upon humiliation has fallen upon the Papacy—the climax being the total loss of territorial power in 1870, following immediately upon the evidence of the grossest spiritual darkness, as manifested by the blasphemous Decrees of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility. And whereas in the fifteenth century there was hardly a single “Protestant” congregation in the world, today there are fully 200 millions of people who reject the claims of the Papacy. Moreover, the loss of revenue, of property, and of power, has proceeded, *pari passu* (at an equal rate), with the “consumption” of territory and the growth of spiritual darkness in the Popedom. “The great voice.” has not ceased to blaspheme; its accredited organs and mouthpieces have not desisted from promulgating unscriptural and God-dishonoring teaching. The Word of God has not ceased to be proscribed, or witnesses to be persecuted. But the erstwhile “Ruler of the World” is now “the Prisoner in the Vatican”; his “dominion” has ceased to exist; his position is precarious, and may, at any moment, be “destroyed” by forces beyond his control. His conduct in regard to the great War has stamped indelibly upon his brow the name of Infamy, and every day his conduct is showing in a clearer light that he is indeed the successor—not of humble Peter, the Galilean fisherman, but of Judas of Kerioth, the Judæan False Apostle and betrayer of the Lord Jesus Christ and His people.

The parallel between the flight of a projectile and the history of the rise, progress and decadence of Papal power, is equally, if not more, striking if one deals with the 1,260 years only of prophecy. For two-thirds of 1,260 years are 840 years; and one-third is 420 years. The Papacy was “revealed” as such in the seventh century, as all historians admit. It gradually rose to the plenitude of power in the fifteenth century, since when its record is that of decadence in material power, coupled with an ever-increasing and unrepenting spiritual darkness. In prophetic phraseology, “the sword is upon his arm, and his right eye is utterly darkened.” The more rapid its fall from temporal power, the more blasphemous its utterances. Twice has the Papacy been hunted out of Rome; once by Napoleon, once by Revolution. Its third exit will be final and complete, for it is to be “destroyed by the brightness of His coming,” whose names, offices, titles and place, it has for 1,260 years usurped.

#### **(r) THE TESTIMONY OF HISTORY OR THE VERDICT OF HISTORIANS AND LEARNED.**

Let anyone glance over the office of electing and crowning a Pope, and he will there see, in small compass, how truly, precisely, and fully the Roman Pontiffs realize and fulfill, in their self-assumed titles and pretensions, all the characteristics included in the above catalog, and therefore in the Divinely-revealed designative official title, “The Antichrist.”

It is no valid objection to say that the Pope does not expressly call himself God. To this it is enough to say that in Scripture there is no such prediction concerning the Antichrist. As a fact, anyone who, in the name of God, pretends to be able to invent a “Sacrament” for Christ’s Church, does in reality usurp the place of God, for it is literally taking the place of the Author of Grace, as none but He can institute a “Sacrament,” or make visible matter—or any human ceremony or rite—a channel of His grace or gifts. It is written of the Antichrist that he “taketh his seat (or Cathedra) in the *naos* of God—or professing Church—showing himself as God,” i.e., not calling himself God, but so acting as if he were God. It is thus that Chrysostom explains the word “showing”; and he also says (on 2 Thess. ii.): “he will be a sort of instead-God (*anti theos*) or vice-God, and will order himself to be worshipped—*anti tou Theou*—in God’s stead,” i.e., as God’s representative and Vice-regent. Hippolytus, another Greek Father, says: “he will in everything put himself on an equality with the Savior.” Nor does John, in 1 John ii. 22, and 2 John vii., say anything as to the nature or manner of the denial of the Father and the Son, whether express and direct, or only in effect and virtual. The latter fully meets all the terms of the prophecy, as has already been demonstrated by citations from the Apostles’ writings and use of the word “deny.”

Neither is there any substance in the objection that no one who professes the doctrine of the Trinity or other Christian truth can be the Antichrist, for it is solely in virtue of professing the Nicene Creed that Antichrist can be said with truth to sit in the *naos* of God.

It is by the claim to be the Visible Head of the Universal Church of Christ, added to other impious and blasphemous titles, that *expressly*, as well as virtually, in effect, and to all real intents and purposes, the Antichrist usurps the place both of God and of Christ, and so excludes or “denies” both the Father and the Son from the Government of the Church of God on earth, i.e., the so-called “Catholic Church.” The title, “Vicar of Christ,” can only be turned into Greek by Antichristos, and is a self-given title of infamy, which identifies the bearer as “The Man of the Apostasy,” i.e., the Vice Christ or substitute for Christ. Nay; it is exceedingly doubtful whether such self-given title be not “the sin that hath never forgiveness,” (1 John. v. 16; Matt. xii. 31) i.e., blasphemy, against the only True Substitute (John xiv. 16, 26; xvi. 7) for Christ on earth, the Holy Ghost; for which reason the bearer of such title is, by the Holy Ghost’s inspiration, denounced as “son of perdition.” (2 Thess. ii. 3; Rev. xvii. 8, 11)

The sin of Antichrist is neither physical nor moral. It is wholly spiritual, though, of course, spiritual darkness (2 Cor. iv.; 1 Peter v. 8; 1 John i. 6; Rev. xvi. 10) or “strong delusion” (2 Thess. ii) usually is accompanied by its own “fruits,” whether physical or moral, just as in the case of the Apostle Judas, who was a thief, (John xii. 6) as well as a charlatan and traitor. We do not read, however, of Judas being in other respects evil, or living a scandalous life. It is therefore a mistake to expect the anti-type to be, necessarily, a flagitious character, or conspicuously malevolent. No such characteristics are predicted of the “little horn,” “the son of perdition,” “the Beast,” or “the Antichrist.” Its sin is *spiritual*. It is “blasphemy,” (Isaiah xxxvii. 23) in the sense that term is invariably used in Holy Writ, viz., bringing discredit on God’s Name, or usurping God’s attribute and functions, or opposing and counterfeiting the Holy Ghost.

The view historians have taken of the system ruled by the Popes as a “Kingdom ” may be gathered, to some extent, from the following extracts:—

Dr. Arnold, in his “Life and Correspondence” (Vol. 2), said: “That the Church system, or rather the Priest system, is not to be found in Scripture, is as certain as that the worship of Jupiter is not the



doctrine of the Gospel. It is to my mind more than anything else the exact fulfillment of the apostolic language concerning Antichrist. The Priest is either Christ or Antichrist; he is either our Mediator or he is the man of sin in God's Temple." "It is a system of blasphemous falsehood such as St. Paul foretold was to come, such as St. John saw to be already in the world" (Letters 258, 273, 274).

Lecky ("History of European Morals"): "In the first two centuries of the Christian Church the moral elevation was extremely high . . . In the century before Constantine (A.D. 312), a marked depression was already manifest. . . The two centuries after Constantine are uniformly represented by the Fathers as a period of general and scandalous vice. *The Dark Ages, as the period of Catholic ascendancy is justly called . . . should probably be placed in all intellectual virtues lower than in any other period in the history of man-kind.*"

Gibbon ("Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire"): "In the seventh century the Church had relapsed into the semblance of paganism. In the long period of 1,200 years which elapsed between the reign of Constantine and the Reformation of Luther, the worship of saints and relics corrupted the pure and perfect simplicity of the Christian model."

Lord Macaulay ("Essays"): "It is impossible to deny that the polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. . . . The experience of 1,200 eventful years, the ingenuity and patient care of forty generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection, that, among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and controlling mankind, it occupies the highest place" (on Ranke's "History of the Popes, 1852," p. 548).

Lecky ("History of European Morals"): "It is indeed difficult to conceive any clearer proof than was furnished by the history of the 1,200 years after the conversion of Constantine, that it is by no means for the advantage of mankind that in the form which the Greek and Catholic Churches present, it should become a controlling arbiter of civilization."

La Guidara ("An Echo from the Vatican," p. 190): "Observe that Popery bears something of the semblance of Christianity in order to deceive, just as the counterfeit coin resembles that which is genuine. When Satan found that Christianity was advancing, and that wicked men would not be satisfied without a new religion, he invented Popery, by which he has been more successful in destroying souls than by any of his previous contrivances."

Dr. H. Ward Beecher "The Papal Conspiracy Ex-posed," pp. 176, 177): "The system, as a system, is false and pernicious, and though not framed at once as a whole by any man or body of men as a fraud, was framed by that one far-seeing, comprehensive mind of whom the Apostle speaks—once in Heaven and familiar with the whole character, laws and administration of God, deeply versed in all questions of theology, skilled in organization and government, perfectly acquainted with all the phases of the human mind, and of society, and a master of all the arts of sophistry and delusion to a degree beyond the conception of a human mind, and before whom all men and nations not illuminated and defended by God, are, by reason of their dislike of the truth, mere simpletons—objects of his craft and delusive power—entangled in his snares, led captive at his will.

*"He, living, whilst generations die, is able to lay a plan requiring centuries for its execution.*

*"Availing himself of all these, he has, by a delusive process, holding up great and good ends, such as preserving doctrine and unity in the Church, produced a system adapted, on the whole, to do as much evil and as little good as in existing circumstances was possible.*

“Now, when I call the system of the Romish hierarchy a stupendous fraud, I mean that it is a system devised by Satan for this very end, . . . The delusion has been strong and complete to an amazing degree.”

Blunt (“History of the Reformation in England,” p. 130): “If the Pope was St. Peter’s successor, wherein, it was asked, did the succession consist? What one thing had St. Peter like the Pope, or the Pope like St. Peter? Did St. Peter call himself the Head of the Church, Bishop of Bishops, and usurp dominion over all God’s creatures? Did he exempt himself from the power of civil government; maintain wars; set princes at variance; or sit in a chair with a purple gown and royal scepter and diadem of gold and precious stones, and set his feet on kings’ necks?” (John Ruskin: “The most debasing and degrading of all creeds.” Sir W. Scott: “A mean and depraving superstition.”)

Isaac Barrow, on the Pope’s supremacy (p. 85): “It seemeth, therefore, a sacrilegious arrogance (derogating from our Lord’s honor) for any man to assume or admit those titles of ‘Sovereign of the Church, Head of the Church, our Lord, Arch-Pastor, Highest Priest, Chief Doctor, Master, Father, Judge of Christians’; upon what pretense, or under what distinction soever, these ‘pompatic, foolish, proud, perverse, wicked, profane words: these names of singularity, elation, vanity, blasphemy’ (to borrow the epithets with which Pope Gregory I. doth brand the titles of ‘Universal Bishop’ and ‘Ecumenical Patriarch,’ no less modest in sound, and far more innocent in meaning, than those now ascribed to the Pope) are therefore to be regretted . . . because they do encroach upon our only Lord, to Whom they do only belong. . . .”

John Henry Newman, in 1834, before leaving the Church of England, said: “The spirit of Old Rome has risen again in its former place, and has evidenced its identity by its works.. In the corrupt Papal system we have the very cruelty, the craft, and the ambition of the Republic; its cruelty in its unsparing sacrifice of the happiness and virtue of individuals to a phantom of public expediency, in its forced celibacy within, and its persecutions without; its craft in its falsehoods, its deceitful deeds and lying wonders; and its grasping ambition in the very structure of its polity, in its assumptions of universal dominion; old Rome is still alive; nowhere have its eagles lighted, but it still claims the sovereignty under another pretense” (“Essay on Development of Christian Doctrine,” Advertisement, p. vii.).

After he became a Papist, Newman thus described the history of the Papacy (Ibid., pp. 450 *et seq.*): “First of all were the bitter persecutions of the Pagan Empire in the early centuries; then its sudden conversion, the liberty of Christian worship, the development of the *cultus sanctorum* (the worship of the saints), and the reception of monachism (monasticism) into the ecclesiastical system. Then came the irruption of the barbarians; and then occupation of the *orbis terrarum* (the world), first from the North, then by the Saracens from the South. Then came the time of thick darkness; and afterwards two great struggles, one with the material power, the other with the intellect of the world, terminating in the ecclesiastical monastery, and in the theology of the schools.”

Charles Dickens (“Life,” by Forster, Vol. II., p. 274) described Popery as “the most horrible means of political and social degradation left in the world.”

Lord Macaulay (“History of England,” Vol. I., p. 47) says that “the loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor.”

Professor Huxley (“Daily News,” October 28th, 1871): “There is no engine so carefully calculated for the destruction of all that is highest in the moral nature, in the intellectual freedom, and in the

political freedom of mankind, as that engine that is at present wielded by the Ultramontane section of the Catholic Church.”

Mr. Gladstone, describing the Kingdom of Naples under Bomba and the Papacy, when the Church was presided over by a Cardinal Archbishop, and “the Jesuits were the body who, perhaps, stood nearest to the Government.” when “it was an Augean stable of ignorance, pauperism, brigandage and vice” (as J. W. Probym described it in his “Essays on Italy,” p. 77); said he had “seen Perjury, the daughter of Fraud, the mother of Cruelty and Violence, stalk abroad, under the sanction of its government.” A country where, by means of a Philosophical Catechism for the use of primary schools, there were taught, under the veil of religion, “principles at once false, base and demoralizing.” He declared that “no more cunning plot was ever devised. . . . against the freedom, the happiness, the virtue of mankind” (Second Letter to the Earl of Aberdeen, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.).

Gladstone: “The proselytizing agency of the Roman Church in this country I take to be one of the worst of the religious influences of the age.” “A perpetual war against the progress and the movement of the human mind.”

Lord Macaulay (“History of England.” Vol. I., p. 47) declared that “during the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been in inverse proportion to her power.”

Burnet (“History of His Own Times,” Vol. IV., p. 400, Edit. 1815) said: “Popery is a mass of impostures, supported by men who manage them with great advantage, and impose them with inexpressible severities on those who dare call anything in question that they dictate to them.”

Gill (“The Papal Drama.” Longmans, 1866, Book XI., p. 408): “The prince has convicted the Pontiff; the hindering, debasing, stifling, grinding, territorial dominion has borne damning witness against the ecclesiastical system. . . . The power with the loftiest pretensions in the world has proved incapable of the pettiest achievement. . . The Vicars of Christ have scandalously misgoverned a petty principality.”

Adam Smith (“Wealth of Nations,” Book V., Ch. i., Part iii., Art.3) : “The Church of Rome is the most formidable combination that ever was formed against the authority and security of civil government, as well as against the liberty, reason, and happiness of mankind.”

Gladstone (“Speeches of Pope Pius IX.” p. 173): “When the Pope speaks of the liberation of the Church, he means merely this, that it is to set its foot on the neck of every other power; and when he speaks of peace in Italy he means the overthrow of the established order, if, by a re-conversion of Italians to his way of thinking, well; but if not, then by the old and favorite Roman expedient, the introduction of foreign arms invading the land, to put down the national sentiment and to re-establish the temporal government of the Clerical order.”

We, fortunately, possess a great deal of information respecting the condition of the Papal States when “the temporal government of the Clerical order” bore sway. Out of a mass of accounts, let the following be pondered:—

Farini (“History of Rome,” Book I, Ch. i.): “There was no care for the cultivation of the people, no anxiety for public prosperity. Rome was a cesspool of corruption, of exemptions, and of privileges; a clergy, made up of fools and knaves, in power; laity slaves; the treasury plundered by gangs of

tax-farmers and spies; all the business of government consisted of prying into and punishing the notions, the expectations, and the imprudences of the Liberals.”

Dean Alford (“Letters from Abroad,” pp. 66-67): “Here we have the most absolute monarch in the world, ruling a capital by no means large, with a numerous staff of military and police; and, besides, assisted by 20,000 French troops. And besides this, we have here a people whose state, physical, moral, and intellectual, is the result of accumulated centuries of a government and institutions, according to the advocates of the Papacy, the best in the world, and administered by infallible wisdom, unerring justice, spotless integrity, and unimpeachable truth. How, then, does it stand with Rome, in point of security and good order? Unquestionably, in both these points, it is the worst city in the civilized world.”

In Dean Stanley’s “Life of Dr. Arnold” (Vol. II., p. 411, London, 1844) we read: “This is the last night, I trust, in which I shall sleep in the Pope’s dominions; for it is impossible not to be sickened with a government such as this, which discharges no one function decently. The ignorance of the people is prodigious: how can it be otherwise?”

Garibaldi (“The Rule of the Monk,” Vol. I., p. 29): “In the year 1848, when a Republican Government was established in France, which was the signal for a general revolutionary movement throughout Europe, and the present Pope was forced to escape in the disguise of a menial, while a National Government granted, for the first time in Rome, religious toleration. One of the first orders of the Roman Republic was that the nuns should be liberated, and the convents searched. Giuseppe Garibaldi, in 1849, then recently arrived in Rome, visited in person every convent, and was present during the whole of the investigations. In all, without an exception, he found instruments of cruelty; and in all, without an exception, were vaults, plainly dedicated to the reception of the bones of infants. Statistics prove that in no city is there so great a number of children born out of wedlock as in Rome; and it is in Rome also that the greatest number of infanticides takes place.

“This must ever be the case with a wealthy unmarried priesthood and a poor, ignorant population.”

George Augustus Sala (“Rome and Venice,” p. 339): “Many years have elapsed since Lord John Russell denounced the government of the Pope as the very worst in Europe, and, save in a few insignificant particulars, it has not changed since. The government of the States of the Church is worse even than that of Turkey, where there is, at least, religious toleration and commercial freedom.”

Dr. Henry C. Lea, in “An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church” (2nd Ed., Enlarged, 1884) said: “The Latin Church is the great fact which dominates the history of modern civilization. Nowhere do we see combined effort, nowhere can we detect a pervading impulse, irrespective of locality or circumstance, save in the imposing machinery of the Church Establishment. This meets us at every point, and in every age, and in every sphere of action. This vast fabric of ecclesiastical supremacy presents one of the most curious problems which the world’s history affords. A wide and absolute authority, deriving its force from (im)moral power alone, marshaling no legions of its own in battle array, but permeating everything with its influence . . . such was the papal hierarchy, a marvel and a mystery.”

What Dr. Lea styles “moral power” in reality is founded on the following blasphemous claim of the Papal hierarchy. It is extracted from a large work by Abbé Gaume, entitled “Catechisme de Persévérance” (Vol. IV., p. 288): “What language of man can speak the dignity of the priesthood and the greatness of the Priest? Kings of the earth are great, who command vast armies and make

the world tremble at the sound of their name. Ah well! there is one man greater still. He is a man who, every day, when he pleases, opens the gates of Heaven, and, addressing himself to the Son of the Eternal, to the Monarch of the worlds, says to Him: ‘Descend from Your Throne, Come!’ Docile, at the voice of this man, the Word of God, He by Whom all things were made, instantly descends from the seat of His glory, and incarnates Himself in the hands of this man, *more powerful than Kings, than the angels*, than the august Mary. And this man says to Him: ‘Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee, Thou art my Victim ’—and He lets Himself be *immolated* by this man, placed where he wills, given to whom he chooses; this man is the Priest.

“Thus the Priest, powerful as God, can, in an instant, snatch the sinner from Hell, render him fit for Paradise, and make a slave of the Devil, a son of Abraham ... *God Himself is obliged to adhere to the judgment of the Priest.*”

The “Western Watchman” of March 25, 1912, said: “The Pope is not only the representative of Jesus Christ, but he is Jesus Christ himself hidden under the veil of flesh. Does the Pope speak? It is Jesus Christ who speaks. So that when the Pope speaks, we have no business to examine. We have only to obey.”

Garibaldi was therefore right when he declared the Papacy to be the “greatest plague” that any country could have inflicted on it—when one considers that every priest claims to be as “powerful as God,” and that the Popedom is simply a Kingdom of Priests, governed by the False Vicar of Christ.

Professor Killen, in his “The Old Catholic Church,” p. 392, says: “It is a most significant fact that the Pope was indebted for his position as an earthly sovereign to his support of the worship of images. Though among the rulers he was only a “little horn,” or a petty monarch, his power was not to be measured by the extent of his territories; for he was ‘diverse’ from other royal personages, as he was supposed to possess attributes of peculiar and tremendous potency; and the acknowledgment of his pretensions gave him an ascendancy over all his fellows. ‘In this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.’ (Dan. vii. 24) Such a description applies exactly to the Bishop of Rome, for with unceasing vigilance he has ever been looking out for opportunities of aggrandizement.”

### **What The Pope Claims.**

“Etudes,” January 20th, 1927- Pere Yves de la Brière, S.J., declares the Pope is supreme religious ruler; he has “full immediate and ordinary jurisdiction over every single Catholic.” When he issues a Law or Precept of any kind, it is not a question of his Infallibility but of his Authority. The Pope may recommend Catholics to follow one line of conduct rather than another, even in civil or political matters. For example. Leo XIII. recommended the German Center Party to vote Bismarck’s military budget in 1887, in order to facilitate a favorable conclusion of the Kultur Kampf, although they had intended to oppose it.

“Letters to His Holiness, Pope Pius X.” by A Modernist (i.e., a learned Romish ecclesiastic), 1910, p. 61 *et seq.*: “Your Papal See, Sovereign Pontiff, is the most exclusive despotism, the most absolute autocracy, the most humiliating tyranny, that still defies public opinion and outrages the conscience of mankind.” “What liberties can be safely entrusted to a Papacy, in itself so absolute, and surrounded by these lesser absolutisms?” “These miniature Curias, these Popes in little, whether black, brown, or white, of the great orders, exist about the Vatican, very largely for purposes of aggrandizement and intrigue.” “You are the instrument of the worst despotism in the world.”

## Chapter VIII. Absurdity of Modern Theories

THE learned Rev. C. H. H. Wright, D.D., in his “Daniel and his Prophecies” (Willams & Norgate, 1906, p. xiv.) says: “The Futuristic School of prophetic interpretation has been, to no small degree, responsible for the success which has attended the modern onslaught on the credibility of the prophecies of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. The interpreters of that narrow school of thought, however, imagine themselves to be the only real defenders of Holy Scripture. The origin of that school, in its modern phase, may be traced back to Ribera, a distinguished Jesuit expositor (1585), and to the other remarkable Jesuit interpreters of the seventeenth century. Futurist views of prophecy, as was natural, were soon accepted by the theologians of the High Church School, and were also caught up by many popular preachers of the Evangelical party in the National Church. The interest, however, in prophetic studies, did not long continue to be a general characteristic of the High Church party, but their prophetic views spread among writers of the so called ‘Plymouth Brethren.’ Most of their leaders wrote on prophecy, and all more or less in support of Futuristic views. *A craving after sensationalism* is a marked characteristic of many of the writers of the Futurist School. The Book of Daniel itself ought to have acted as a warning against their fantastic views of the imaginary Antichrist of the latter days. These novel Futurists expound the prophecies as teaching that the disconnected ten kingdoms will all be joined together again (contrary to the statement of Daniel ii. 43,44), and Satan visibly seated on the throne of a united world, when the Son of Man shall appear. *All these are idle dreams of men imperfectly acquainted with the prophecies.*

“‘The Antichrist’ and ‘the deceiver’ has been working in the Church since St. John’s days (2 John vii.). The outward and visible Church very soon began to wrap earth-woven robes around her, and to dream of ‘infallibility,’ all the while that she abounded with false doctrines, and had departed widely from the ‘faith once for all delivered to the Saints.’ *Outside the Church there is no Antichrist, in the Biblical sense of the term;* inside the Church that evil power has sat for nearly 2,000 years as ‘God in the temple of God.’

“The attempt to interpret Old and New Testament prophecies literally, as these writers term it, led the Futurists into conclusions which, as Professor Birks, of Cambridge, long ago stated, tended to undermine the foundations of all Christian evidences. That learned writer noted that their reasonings and principles were more incredulous than those of the infidel, and asserted that, when such opinions gained general currency and approval in the Church, the reign of open infidelity would be at hand. This statement was made about 1841, in his book on the ‘First Elements of Sacred Prophecy.’

“Similar warnings to that effect were uttered by other writers. The warnings have passed by unheeded. *What was foreseen has long since come to pass.*”

Again, in a footnote to p. 238, Dr. Wright said, in criticism of these modern Futurists: “The English Futurist expositors of our day, highly dogmatic in their tone (Mr. Pember and Sir R. Anderson) . . . are intensely dogmatic on points on which the evidence adduced is most uncertain. Sir R. Anderson’s ‘Daniel in the Critic’s Den’ . . . breaks down completely when it comes to interpretation. Mr. Pember’s book is thoroughly unscientific, even from an ‘orthodox’ point of view. It is strangely fanciful and wild in its ideas respecting a reign of Satan, and lays undue stress upon the scandalous aberrations of the Paris ‘Luciferians’ . . . to propound the theory that Satan in person will be actually worshiped by the world at large, and that Society will sink into utter chaos before the Second

Advent, is opposed to all Scripture. These ultra-literalists are *doing as much damage to God's Word* as the critics whom they regard as the precursors of Antichrist."

On p. 239 he says: "The mistakes . . . may be traced up to the false schools of exegesis, in which they were trained, and have been mainly due to their desire to predict a future quite outside the horizon of the prophecy. There is not a line in the prophecy (Daniel ix.) concerning 'the Antichrist,' of whom the Fathers wrote so fantastically."

It must be remembered that Dr. Wright was a great scholar, learned in Hebrew and Greek, and therefore competent to pass judgment on such incautious and wild writers as those he criticizes, and who are as ignorant of Hebrew as they are of Oriental figures of speech or turns of thought.

Another eminent and scholarly author, the Rev. E. B. Elliott, to his learned Commentary on the Apocalypse—than which no more able an examination of sacred prophecy has ever appeared, has added a "Critical Examination and Refutation of the Three Chief Counter-Schemes of Apocalyptic Interpretation"—the German Preterist, the Futurist, and the "Church-Scheme." Of the second he says ("Hore Apocalypstiae," Vol. IV., p. 506): "The Futurists" is the *Second* grand Anti-Protestant Apocalyptic scheme. I might perhaps have thought it sufficient to refer the reader to Mr. Birks' masterly work in refutation of it, but for the consideration that my own would be incomplete without some such examination of this Futurist scheme. . . The Futurist scheme was first, or nearly first, propounded about 1590 by the Jesuit Ribera, as the fittest one whereby to turn aside the Protestant application of the Apocalyptic prophecy from the Church of Rome. In England and Ireland, of late years, it has been brought into vogue chiefly by Mr. Maitland and Mr. Burgh; followed by Mr. Newman, in some of the Oxford Tracts on Antichrist. Its general characteristic is to view the whole Apocalypse . . . as a representation of the events of the consummation and Second Advent all still future; literal Israel; literal days; and the Antichrist . . . a personal infidel to reign for just three and a half years." . . . "A great advantage that they have over the Preterists" is "that instead of being in any measure chained down by the facts of history, they *can draw on the unlimited powers of fancy, wherewith to devise in the dreaming future whatever may seem to them to fit the sacred prophecy.*"

Mr. Elliott triumphantly shows "the insuperable difficulties attending the Futurist scheme," how it "sets language, grammar and context at defiance"; how "inconsistency" marks it from beginning to end; how erroneous is their conception of Antichrist; how self-contradictory and illogical; how opposed to History, Scripture and the Ancient Fathers is the Futurist view of the religion of Antichrist; and "that it is not merely unaccordant with the Apocalyptic and the other cognate prophecies of Antichrist, but that it is, even intellectually speaking, a mere rude and commonplace conception of Satan's predicted masterpiece of opposition to Christ, compared with what has been actually realized and established in the Papacy" (p. 539). "The Papal system is beyond anything that the Futurists have imagined, or ever can imagine, the very perfection of Anti-Christianism," because "an open, desperate enemy, sworn against your life, family, friends, property," is infinitely less dangerous and offensive than "one that, while professing the utmost friendship, by some strange impersonation of you, in your absence, insinuates himself into your place in the family, seduces your wife to be as his wife, your children to look to him as their father; then makes use of his opportunities to train them into unfaithfulness and rebellion to all your most solemn and cherished wishes and commands; falsifying your letters, and forging your handwriting, in order the more effectually to carry out his plan; and even at length framing an image, and breathing voice into it, and by magic art and strong delusion making men believe that it was yourself speaking, in

expression of perfect approval of this proceedings, as those of your chief friend, plenipotentiary and chosen substitute.”

“Such is somewhat the view of Antichrist sketched in Scripture prophecy; such what has been realized in the Popes and Popedom. And, horrid as was the Atheism of the French Revolutionists, yet must I beg leave to doubt whether, in God’s view, it was as horrid an abomination, even at its worst, as the blasphemous hypocrisies and betrayal of Christ in the polished Court and Church Councils of His Usurping Vicar and impersonator. Sharp as were the thorns and nails and spear of the Pagan soldiery, they were surely less painful to the Savior than the kiss of Judas.” (Psa. lv. 12-14)

Professor T. R. Birks (“First Elements of Sacred Prophecy”), after enumerating the “maxims in the interpretation of the sacred prophecies generally received by the Protestant Churches, ever since the time of the Reformation,” adds “all of these maxims, however, without distinction, have been rejected by several late writers . . . Burgh, Maitland, Todd, Dodsworth, Tyso, MacCausland, Govett. . . . They agree in few points, except in rejecting the conclusions of all previous expositors; and maintain that nearly the whole of Daniel’s prophecies and of the Apocalypse are unfulfilled. Now, if the theories of these writers are entirely groundless, the responsibility which they have incurred is very great, and the effects of their error may prove extremely fatal to the Church. The strongest bulwark against the revived zeal of the Romish Church will have been taken away when it is most needed; and the danger of a renewed apostasy will have been fearfully increased. . . A spirit of feverish and skeptical doubt . . . will have been injected, without warrant, into the minds of thousands; the light which the Word of God has thrown on half the whole period of the Church’s history, will have been quenched in darkness; and her hopes for the future, by a perplexed and fallacious application of irrelevant prophecies, be involved in a chaos of fanciful conjectures and inextricable confusion.”

Mr. Birks, by a careful analysis of the statements of the above-mentioned Futurists, demonstrates incontrovertibly their “rashness,” “emptiness,” their “groundless,” “untrue” attacks upon Protestant expositors of note; their “gross absurdity,” which “directly contradict the early writers”; their “irrelevance,” “inconsistence,” “self-contradictions,” “illogicality”; their “bold inversion of facts,” “willful perversions of Scripture”; and, finally, “the view of the Futurists brings down the servants of God in every age to the level of the unbelievers . . . and, by a wretched alchemy, turns all their most patient and prayerful researches into one pile of laborious blunders. This reason alone, with every thoughtful Christian, should be enough to convict their [Futurist] system, as a system, of utter falsehood.”

These words were published in 1843, *before* the Higher Critics, and Rationalists and Futurists had succeeded in so emasculating all testimony against Antichrist as to produce complete confusion and Babylonianism in “the Church.” Since then, owing to the rapid growth of error, which is ever swifter than Truth, these allies have succeeded in breaking down the Witness of Protestantism against Popery, whether in the Established Churches, or in un-Established Churches; and the only gainer has been, and still is, the Antichrist of prophecy.

The late Dr. H. Grattan Guinness, in his “Approaching End of the Age” (pp. 95 *et seq.*) said: “The Futurist view is that which teaches that the prophetic visions of Revelation, from chapters iv. to xix., prefigure events still wholly future, and not to take place till just at the close of this dispensation. It supposes ‘an instant plunge of the Apocalyptic prophecy into the distant future of the



consummation.’ This view gives the literal Israel a large place in the Apocalypse, and expects a solitary infidel Antichrist, who shall bitterly oppress the saints for three and a half years, near the date of the Second Advent, thus interpreting *time* as well as much else in the Apocalypse, *literally*. In its present form it may be said to have originated at the end of the sixteenth century with the Jesuit Ribera, who, moved like Alcazar to relieve the Papacy from the terrible stigma cast upon it by the Protestant interpretation, tried to do so by referring these prophecies to the distant *future*, instead of, like Alcazar, to the distant past. It is held under a great variety of modifications, no two writers agreeing as to what the symbols *do* prefigure. . . The Futurist view denies progressive revelation. . .”

Dr. Guinness replies, in an Appendix, to various Futurist attacks upon his work. One is by a “Plymouth Brother,” of whom Dr. Guinness remarks: “The critic who undertakes to reply to a work of this character should at least be accurate in his statements of the views he opposes. The anonymous author is very much the reverse, and spends most of his strength in commenting on confusions which he has himself created. A peculiar tone of dogmatism which pervades his remarks is not calculated to produce conviction in thoughtful minds. The ‘reply’ is, in fact, superficial and inaccurate. . . Futurist critics are an enigma. . . They cannot deny or be blind to certain grand historical facts . . . yet they deny that the symbols foretell the facts. . . though Futurists admit how exactly the symbols of prophecy answer to these facts . . . and they assert—*what, of course, can neither be proved nor disproved*—that they foretell other future events!

“Not only by this writer, but by all writers of the Futurist School, are these supposed future acts of the supposed future Antichrist largely discussed and gravely insisted on. Few would surmise how frail the foundation on which this cardinal doctrine that Antichrist is to make a covenant with the Jews—rests. Few would suppose that the notion has really *no solid ground at all in Scripture*, but is derived from an erroneous interpretation of one single clause of one single text . . . Daniel ix, 27 . . . one of the gravest evils of Futurism is the terrible way in which it tampers with this great fundamental prophecy, applying to . . . Antichrist its *Divine* description of . . . Christ.”

Referring to another Futurist critic, Sir Robert Anderson, and his “The Coming Prince, the Last Great Monarch of Christendom,” Dr. Guinness remarked: “The title is a combination of error and assumption, . . . ‘The Coming Prince’—intended as it is for a quotation from Daniel ix. 26, is an erroneous citation, for there is no definite article in the Hebrew. The book . . . is marred by error and assumption, as well as by rash statements and wild speculations. It is also marred by a disrespectful, supercilious manner . . . which is neither gentlemanly nor Christian . . .” So close and accurate is the correspondence of history with prophecy (in the division of the Roman earth into ten kingdoms) that . . . this writer himself perceives it, while he denies it . . . for he admits that the existing state of things in Europe is ‘undoubtedly a feature of the prophecy.’

“The monstrous ‘gap’ theory of the Futurist School is maintained in the most dogmatic way by Dr. Anderson, who makes the strangely false assertion that ‘all Christian interpreters are agreed in it’ . . . ‘the entire Historic School of Protestant interpreters . . . would utterly and unhesitatingly reject such an interpretation as offensive to common sense, and doing violence to the oracles of God.’” “The Futurist theory, which confines the evil career . . . of Antichrist to a period *subsequent* to the destruction of Babylon by the ten horns *must* be erroneous . . . “Futurists are obliged to admit that the Babylon of Rev. xvii. is the Apostate Church of Rome. They cannot, moreover, question that the Church of Rome has endured for twelve or thirteen centuries. The great Anti-Christian persecution takes place *during* the reign of Babylon, *not* after her destruction. That destruction is

followed, not by that great Anti-Christian persecution, but by the Marriage of the Lamb (Rev. xix.).” “If the ten kingdoms have existed for the last thirteen or fourteen centuries, so has the Antichrist, for he is their contemporary; and Futurism falls to the ground.

“To conclude: The Futurist conception of Antichrist as an openly-avowed Atheist, an infidel King, who will oppose all religion and morality, and set himself in direct and daring opposition to Christ, is, to say the best of it, an unutterably poor and low conception, even intellectually, compared to the great and terrible reality.”

The last authority to be cited is the late Dr. M. O’Sullivan, whose “Of the Apostasy predicted by St. Paul,” published in 1842, is by far the most cautious, careful, and erudite analysis of Scripture known to me. It possesses also the merit of critically examining the Futurist theories of Dr. Todd and other writers of that school. Its extensive knowledge of Greek, of Scripture, and of prophecy, establishes it as a monument of learning, and fidelity to the text. Now what is the view of this elaborate commentary? It simply annihilates, though most courteously, the Futurist perversions of Scripture, which do duty for interpretations of prophecy. With great patience, and infinite care, it shows how “conjecture as to the interpretation of a prophecy” is miscalled “consideration of the true meaning” of such terms as “Apostasy”; how mere “opinions” are twisted into “*authority* to determine the meaning of terms.” Take, for instance, the phrase, “Temple of God,” which Dr. Todd and other Futurists—in spite of admissions that “a modern Christian might very well understand the Church of Christ”—persist in regarding *literally* of some still future earthly building, in which a solitary Antichrist is to sit. Dr. O’Sullivan patiently investigates past solutions and Futurist assumptions, pointing out objections, difficulties, inconsistencies, fallacies, and contradictions—confusion between “literal” and “material,” between apostolic usage of terms and Futurist misuse of them. He cites McKnight on the Epistles: “It is an observation of Bochart, that after the death of Christ, the Apostles never called the temple of Jerusalem the temple of God, but as often as they used that phrase they meant the Christian Church (1 Tim. iii. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Ephes. ii. 19, 24). Besides, in the Revelation of St. John, which was written some years after the destruction of Jerusalem, there is mention made of men’s ‘becoming pillars in the Temple of God’ (Rev. iii. 12).” “Hence, it is evident that the ‘sitting of the man of sin in the Temple of God’ *by no means implies* that he was to show himself in Judea.”

Dr. O’Sullivan then contrasts the language the Apostles used when they spoke of the Temple at Jerusalem. “St. Paul, for example, speaks of that edifice five times (Acts xxii. 17; xxiv. 12-18; xxv. 8; xxvi. 21). In every instance he styles it ‘the temple,’ not once ‘the temple of God.’” “In the words, ‘Know ye not that ye are the Temple of God?’ (1 Cor. iii. 16), there is an interrogatory . . . that those whom the Apostle addressed were prepared to understand the name ‘temple of God’ in the sense in which the writer used it,” and not as Dr. Todd and Futurists misuse it, viz., a *material* sense (pp. 31-32). Dr. Todd actually admits that he cannot “see any Scriptural authority” “that Antichrist should rebuild the temple,” or “how a temple built by Antichrist for his own purposes can be properly called the Temple of God.” (p. 36).

In regard to the term, “the man of sin,” which the Douay Bible (Stereotyped Edition, A.D. 1825) says must mean “some particular man” “from the frequent repetition of the article *the* man of sin, *the* son of perdition, *the* adversary or opposer. It agrees to the wicked and great Antichrist, who will come before the end of the world,” we see at once the origin of the Futurist theory. It is derived from Romish sources. Yet Dr. Todd adopted this idea and line of argument (Todd’s “Discourses,” p. 233). Dr. O’Sullivan exposes the hollowness of this notion, as well as Dr. Todd’s mendacious

assertion that this idea “has been so understood by all the ancient commentators.” He cites, as an instance to the contrary, Matthies’ “Copious Greek Grammar,” translated by Blomfield. “The article serves to signify that the noun with which it stands indicates either a determinate object among several which are comprehended under the same idea, *or the whole species*” (Vol. I., p. 457); and adds: “thus it appears, on sound principles of grammar, that with equal propriety the article may constitute the noun, to which it is prefixed, the name of an individual or of a class. Its effect in each particular expression must be determined by usage and by the context.” (p. 91).

Further, on pp. 92-93, he shows how false the Futurist idea is, by reference to such Scriptures as Luke iv. 4; Mark ii. 27; 2 Tim. iii. 17; Matt. xii. 35; 1 John ii. 18; Matt. v. 25; John x. 10, 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3; and to the English usage of the indefinite article to individualize an expression, while the definite article enlarges the application of a name to a class or order. “Thus a King or Queen of England is one; *the* King or Queen represents or comprehends many.” “A King has the life of an individual; *the* King never dies,” “*The* man of God” (2 Tim. iv. 17) is the name of a class. In Hebrews ix. 7 “*the* high-priest” means the *succession* of high-priests. There is therefore no necessity—as falsely asserted by Futurists like Dr. Todd—that *Ho anthropos*—the man of sin, should designate one solitary person, but rather the contrary.

Dr. Todd falls into the inconsistency of using the definite article in the very sense he opposed; for he spoke of “the usurped authority of *the* Bishop of Rome,” when he meant the entire succession of Bishops of Rome (p. 95); just as Bishop Bossuet, the Romish opponent of Protestants, fell into the same blunder in the heat of controversy—speaking of the Papacy as *a line of Bishops*. His words were: “All the Roman bishops are to be regarded as the one person of St. Peter, in whom the faith of Peter never should fail.” (“Defensio,” etc., Vol. II., p. 191; O’Sullivan, p. 95).

Dr. O’Sullivan adduces other instances of the absurdity of this particular Futuristic idea about one solitary Antichrist; for instance, the Abbé Banière in his “Histoire Générale de Cérémonie,” etc., Vol. 1, 288, describes “The adoration of the Pope, on the grand altar of St. Peter.” meaning Popes in general; and on p. 287 the same French author says: “*The* Pope thus robed is carried in his chair before the altar of the chapel where he was elected; and there the Cardinal Doyen, and afterwards the other Cardinals, adore his Holiness on their knees.” Upon which Dr. O’Sullivan justly observes: “The article does not pronounce the ‘man of sin’ a single individual. On the contrary, it may, with equal propriety, be regarded as constituting the expression . . . the title of an order or succession.”

On pp. 370-371 Dr. O’Sullivan shows that the word “person” has two different meanings, as explained in Blackstone’s Commentary, Book 1, Ch. i. “Persons are divided by law into either natural persons or artificial.” Natural persons are individuals; artificial persons are corporations or bodies politic. There is the single person who ends at death. There is the perpetual person in whom a community subsists, and also lives by a perpetual succession. Each of these is equally real. “The parson of a parish” is no less intelligible as the appellation of an individual, than of the persons who in succession have charge. “The Pope”, or “the Bishop of Rome” is susceptible of the same twofold application. Lainez, the Jesuit, at the Council of Trent, used this very figure: “These things, that is, to be a key-keeper and a pastor, being *perpetual* offices, must be conferred upon a *perpetual person*, that is, not upon the first only, but upon *all his succession*. So *the Bishop of Rome, from St. Peter to the end of the world*, is true and absolute monarch . . .” (“History of Council of Trent,” Lib. VII p. 571, Brentitraus). So Le Maistre, the Ultramontane, in his work, “Du Pape” (Tome II., p. 344), declares “that *a whole sovereignty* should be considered as *one individual* . . . and that the *succession of the Popes* is incomparably superior to all others.”

In fact all Papal orators or authors speak of “the Pope” and “the Bishop of Rome,” when they mean a perpetual person, not an individual. Thus Cardinal Wiseman in his Lectures; Fénelon, etc. Hence, Futurists are absolutely wrong in interpreting *ho anthropos* as one solitary person.

Dr. O’Sullivan helps the cause of truth also by his *Excursus* on the “Adoration” of the Church of Rome, addressed to Popes, and to Images (pp. 388 *et seq.*). He says: “The evasions which many of her advocates practice in escaping from the real ground of complaint against her, are plainly devices to which no man, who felt his cause good, would condescend to have recourse.” “According to the representations of these advocates, Romanism does not *adore* creatures, whether images or saints.” According to Milner. (“End of Controversy,” 1828, Dublin, p. 258, *note*), “Catholics abstain from applying it [the word ‘worship’] to persons or things inferior to God, making use of the word *honor* or *veneration* in their regard . . .”; “the end for which . . . images are made and retained . . . is to put us in mind of the person they represent. They are not primarily intended for the purpose of being venerated; nevertheless they become entitled to a *relative* or *secondary veneration* . . .”

Butler’s “Lives of the Saints” says that by the Council of Nice’s decree, “images are to be honored, but not with the worship called Latria . . . he who *reveres* the image, reveres the person it represents.” This is not true. Butler deliberately substituted the word “honored” for “*Adored*,” which is the word used by that Council (“Labbe et Cossart,” Vol. XIII., p. 730).

As Dr. Sullivan shows (pp. 390 *et seq.*), “the affection or the reverence which Romanism demands of her votaries for images and saints is *adoration*.” In the “*Pontificale Romanum*,” Rome, 1818 (*Ordo ad recipiendum processionaliter Imperatorem*) it is directed that “the Cross of the legate (i.e., an *image*), because *Latria* is due to it, shall be on the right.” She gives to the worship which she commands the name of the worship which God forbids and reprobates. The name by which Romanism will have this species of worship known is not inappropriate. It is “*douleia*,” or, as the word should be presented in an English form, “slavery” or “bondage.” Thus, indeed, the word is translated in Rome’s Scriptures (Douay Bible, Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 24; v. 1). Both the Romish and the more recently published Versions use the word “bondage” in Gal. iv. 24. The “adoration of bondage” is that which Romanism offers to her saints and images. In Romish Versions, the Second Commandment is rendered, “Thou shalt not ‘adore’ them.” Rome says, “Thou shalt ‘adore’ them.”

The distinction between Latria and Douleia, i.e., the worship offered to God, and the worship offered to images, is not admitted by all Romish writers. Thus the Abbé Bergier says: “To express more clearness in their language, theologians call Latria the worship rendered to God, and Douleia that rendered to saints; but originally these two terms, derived from the Greek, signified equally service without distinction” (“Dictionnaire Théologique,” Art., Culte).

We admit that originally and grammatically the terms Douleia and Latria are synonymous.” (Idid., Art., Dulie).

To get out of the difficulty Bergier declares that “the words Latria, Douleia, Cultus, service, etc., change their meaning according to the different objects to which they are applied” (Ibid., Art., Latria); thus pretending that “worship may have two names, and arbitrarily assigning to words the meaning most convenient to Popery—not to Truth, not according to the reality of things.

For, of course, there is a distinction between the words Douleia and Latria. Popery admits it, by rendering the one “bondage,” and the other “service”: (Rom. xii. 1. Rheimish Version, 1825, Stereotype Edition.) the one is slavery, the other freedom. The one, Douleia, is the condition from

which the Gospel delivers the redeemed (Rom. viii, 15, 21; Gal. iv. 24, v. 1; Heb. ii. 15); the other, the reverential acknowledgment made to God—as Deliverer—by the ransomed.

Popery, therefore, has aptly chosen for its image worship the very name which testifies that while God gives liberty, Rome wishes to bring *bondage*. Thus is Rome's opposition to God once more made manifest. She is *ho antikeimenos*, the Adversary that sets up a Law opposed to the Will of God.

## Appendix A. “The Image of The Beast” (Revelation 13:15)

As “the Beast” is a *symbol*, and represents a Pagan Power, its “image” must not be taken in its literal sense, i.e., must not be understood of a statue, but rather of some representation of the pagan power signified. Otherwise confusion results.

In Revelation xiii. 14, this representation is described as made “to” or “for” the Bestial Power wounded and revived. In Revelation xiii. 15 it is described as both speaking in human language, and causing human beings to be slain for refusing to reverence its decrees.

Now the use of this figure of speech is common in Holy Writ, in classical usage, and in poetical and historic phraseology. Thus in Romans viii. 29: “the image of His Son” (*tees eikonos Tou uiou autou*) is used of no literal effigy, but of character.

Cicero (Pro. P. Sextio., Ed. Ernesti, Vol. VIII., p. 974) uses the same figure when he calls the Consul Piso, “*imaginem antiquitatis*”—“the image of antiquity,” or the representation of antiquity; and Piso's interdict on Capuan perfumery, as “*imagine orname causa*,” “for the sake of the adornment of antiquity.”

Ambrose thus uses the figure (in Epist. 66, Ch. ii.); and in *Questio*, 109 *apud*, Augustine, Op. (Bened. Ed.), Vol. III., p. 109, Appendix, the Christian minister is described as the Envoy of Christ, and therefore His “image”—“*Etenim ejus imago*.”

In the Middle Ages the figure was of common use, in regard to deputies; and in modern days, statesmen have adopted and applied it to the British Parliament as the “express image” of the nation.

Gibbon, in his “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire” (Vol. II., p. 263) uses it also: “From the time of the Punic War, the uninterrupted succession of senators had preserved the name and the image of the Republic”; where the parallel between Revelation xiii. 17, 15, and Gibbon is most marked: “the name of the Beast, the image of the Beast”—being on all fours with “the name and the image of the Republic.”

In the ancient Councils the same figure was used to denote their representative character; members being described as being “the images” of those who sent them (Harduin, iii., 1641-1648).

Moreover, as though expressly to show the fitness of this figure of speech, both Eastern and Western General Councils were represented in sculpture and in painting by an ikon or “image,” a sacred object for reverence (Harduin, iii., 1836; Baronius, ad Ann. 711; Mosheim, viii. 2, 3, 11). So Agatho, Secretary to the Sixth Council; Anastasius; and Ado (vide Note on pp. 186-187 of “*Horae Apocalypticae*,” Vol. III.)—“the image of the Council” being a *picture*. Whence the propriety of

“the image of the Papal Power” to signify the Papal Councils which issued Decrees, formulated doctrines, and consigned “heretics” to the flames. No better symbol than “image of the Beast” could have been used by the inspired penman.

## Appendix B. The Mark of The Beast

“All, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, receive a mark on their right hand, or upon their forehead.”

The word rendered “mark” is “*Charagma*,” any graven mark, or line, character, inscription, a totally different word from that used in Rev. vii. 3, xiv. 1, concerning the “seal” on the forehead of servants of God. It is called, in Rev. xiv. 11, the “mark of his name”; and the “name” and “mark” are bracketed together repeatedly (Rev. xiii. 17; xiv. 9, 11; xv. 2); whence one is forced to infer that there is some connection between the two.

Now the “name” of the Roman “Beast” was long ago suggested by Irenaeus as “*Lateinos*,” or the Latin Man, and no better solution has ever been suggested, for Latin was in John’s day, and has ever been, the sacred tongue of Rome, whether Pagan or Papal; and “*Lateinos*” was the correct way to spell “Latin” in Greek, according to Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Andreas (Greek “Fathers”) the Roman Poet Ennius, and by the Poet Plautus (Latin Poets). The “mark” then must be connected with Latin; it must be “the mark of the Latin man.” Was there, and is there now, any “mark” which is inseparably connected with Roman Latinity?

Undoubtedly this “mark” is *religious*, for it forms the foundation for the Beast’s claim to rule over “all” (i.e., all within the orbit of his tyranny, not “all” in the earth), and to force idolatrous “worship” (Rev. xiii. 15) upon them (cf. Rev. xiv. 9; xv. 4) through his co-adjutor “the false prophet”—clearly a *religious* class.

Now antiquarians, archaeologists, and other scholars, with unanimous voice, declare that the Latin Cross was a sacred Roman symbol (as it was a common Heathen symbol universally adored) long before the First Advent. It is found on coins, medals, tombs, temples, clothes, banners; and Montfaucon, the learned Benedictine, gives numerous examples. It is, indeed, an undeniable fact. This being so, the next point to observe is that the “mark” is impressed upon all subjects of the Latin man—in a particular manner, viz., on the right hand, or upon the forehead. It is so made as to appear graven. It is, in short, a distinguishing mark, the use of which, in a particular way, for purposes of devotion, is the characteristic emblem and certain indication of obedience to the Latin man.

Is the sign of the Latin Cross such a mark? To ask that question is to answer it, for from the moment of birth to the moment of death that mark is impressed with the right hand to the forehead, of all “the faithful” slaves of the Latin Pope or Father of the Latins. Nay, this very fact is actually boasted of and claimed as a proof that this outward mark seals indelibly a “character” upon the soul. Here is what the widely distributed “The Faith of our Fathers,” by James, Cardinal Gibbons (J. Murphy & Co., New York, 1897, PP. 320-321) says:—

“The Sacrament of Confirmation is also known by the name of CRISM, because the FOREHEAD . . . is anointed . . . in the form of a CROSS”; . . . “In the Sacred Crism which is marked on our FOREHEADS He hath sealed us by the INDELIBLE Character Stamped on our souls, which is

indicated by the SIGN OF THE CROSS impressed on us.” “The bishop performs the external unction, but GOD sanctifies the Soul by His SECRET OPERATION.”

Observe the exact correspondence between the prophecy and its fulfillment. The sign of the Latin Cross, made with the right hand to the forehead, upon all followers of the Latin Papa, is declared to be a magic charm which indelibly impresses character upon the Soul; the false prophet of Rome performs the external mark, and simultaneously a secret supernatural operation is effected!

What need to look elsewhere, then, for the Mark of the Beast, when every scholar knows the esoteric meaning of the Latin Cross symbol and its phallic origin? What deadlier insult can be offered to a Holy God than to use that “mark” under pretense of initiating men, women, and children into the Kingdom of God and of His Christ?

### **LATIN CROSS.**

*Always with the right hand, never with the left: always upon the forehead.* (See Pontificale Romanum, Pars Prima, De Confirmandis, p. 1; also Ordo Administrandi Sacramenta.) In baptism the priest makes with the thumb of the right hand the Sign of the Cross on the forehead and also on the breast of the baby, once, and again on the forehead—to keep the devil out of him!

It is unfortunate that our excellent Authorized Version occasionally fails to give the correct sense in certain prophetic passages, although this was inevitable, of course, as greater light was promised in later times. The text from which the above words are taken should read: “who opposeth and exalteth himself *against* (See also Exodus ix. 17 and 2 Cor. x. 5) all that is called God, or that is an object of reverence, so that he, as God, taketh his seat in the Sanctuary\* of God, setting himself forth as God”; not by abuse or denial, but by actions and assumptions of Divinity. Anyone who has studied the Bible knows very well that it constantly designates rulers and judges as gods, and that self-exaltation and arrogance are constantly denounced by Christ (e.g., Matthew xi. 23); whilst the “Naos of God,” or “Sanctuary,” or “House of the Lord,” is as constantly applied to public worship (e.g., Psalm xcii. 13; Acts vii. 48; 1 Cor. iii. 17) and to the whole body of professing Christians, *not to mere buildings*.

\*In the “Acts” the Jewish temple is mentioned twenty-five times; the Greek word used being *hieron*, never *naos*. In 2 Thess. ii, the word is *naos*. Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine, Aquinas say the apostle meant the Christian Church, as in 1 Cor. iii, 16.

As a fact, there is nothing in 2 Thess. ii. that is not already explained in other passages of Scripture. Nothing but lack of familiarity with Oriental phraseology and Hebrew thought can excuse a desire to uphold, at all costs, a visionary theory—originated either by men who lived long *before* the event, and therefore were in a very different position to us who live after it; or by enemies who deliberately seized upon these mistaken guesses, in order to fashion a weapon whereby to deflect from Rome the obvious testimony of Holy Writ and of history. This weapon is known as “Futurism,” because it shuts its eyes to *facts* of the past, and fixes them on *fancies of the future*.

I wish to recall certain undeniable facts (not theories) which show incontestably how self-exaltation and blasphemy are conjoined in the *Papacy*, that *Pagan Caesarism* which wears a religious mask—exactly as foretold by 2 Thess. ii., Rev. xiii. and Daniel vii. and xi. 36-39; and which is the Last or Eighth Head of the Latin Wild Beast of prophecy (Rev. xvii. 11); a *realized fulfillment*, and *not* a still unfulfilled future Antichrist.





Portrait of Antichrist

With the Triple Crown claiming to have power over Heaven, Earth, and Purgatory.

“The Flavelli are the well-known great fans carried on either side of the Pope. According to Macri the eyes of the peacock’s feathers are typical of the vigilance and circumspection of the Pontiff.” (“Last Winter in Rome” by Weld p. 495. Compare Daniel vii. 8, “Eyes of a man.”)

“The Three Crowns (or Tiara) are decorated with 32 rubies, 19 emeralds, 11 sapphires, 529 diamonds, and 252 pearls.” (“Sede Vacante,” a Diary written in 1903 during the Pope’s “enthronement,” by a Papal Chamberlain.)

The Three Crowns, of Tiara, indicate that the wearer is “Father of Princes and Kings, *Ruler of the World*, Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ.” (Catholic Dictionary 1884, p. 796.)

First, as to the usurped “seat” or throne occupied. In Francis. Wey’s “Rome,” illustrated, there is a picture of “St. Peter’s Chair,” by virtue of which the Pope claims to be Apostolic successor of the humble Galilean fisherman— but as it is a false claim, he is a *False Apostle* or “*Son of Perdition*,” as foretold. Here is Wey’s description of this Chair. “There is, in the apse of the Cathedral, a sumptuous altar, and in the middle of a glory, the Chair of St. Peter, sustained, by four colossal figures of bronze and gold, which represent two Fathers of the Latin and two of the Greek Church. The chair by Bernini is only an outside case, containing the curule seat of Egyptian wood faced with ivory, which is, supposed to have been given (compare Rev. xiii. 2: “And the Beast gave him his seat.”) by the Senator Pudens to his, guest, the Apostle Peter. They show in the sacristy a model of



this precious piece, which is rarely exhibited, as well as some of the small ivory facings that have been detached from it; they represent the Labors of Hercules, (Hercules was God of Force, see Dan. xi. 38) and are of indisputable antiquity” (p. 155; see also “The Chair of St. Peter,” by H. Forbes Witherby, and “Jacob Primmer in Rome,” p. 94). Cardinal Wiseman described these ivory ornaments as “The Exploits of the Monster-quelling Hercules,” and said “there are eighteen small compartments, disposed in three rows.”

On the 18th of January every year this old heathen seat is “adored” by Papists on the “Feast of the Chair of St. Peter”; so the Pagan god Hercules receives homage annually by Rome’s dupes, exactly as foretold. These dupes are not aware that the ivory “Labours of Hercules” in this heathen seat are arranged in three rows of six emblems each, so that if one counts the lowest as six units, the next as tens, and the third as hundreds, one obtains the fatal “Number of the Beast”: 666. This *Latin* chair, therefore, is another link in the chain of evidence identifying “The Man of Sin”; for LATEINOS contains the “number of a man,” 666, in Greek numeral letters. LATEINOS was the founder of LATIUM, Rome’s original name, whilst Latin is the official tongue of the Papacy, and of no other system in the world masquerading as Christianity.

The late William Arthur (author of “The Pope, the Kings, and the People”)\* in his “Italy in Transition,” described the self-exaltation of the Pope during “Holy Week,” as seen by himself.

\*See also his “The Pope, the Kings, and the Penile” 72 pp. 271-307, chapter on “An Unequaled Pageant” It is terrifyingly blasphemous.

Here are his words: “After a while the whole of the nave is lined with Guards; first the Swiss Guards, in their harlequin dress, red and yellow and blue hanging in artistic stripes about them—every man as tall as a Horse Guard; then what are called the Palatin Guards. . . . Then the Noble Guards appear—that rare corps of eighty men, every man with a title, dressed nearly like our Horse Guards. At last the procession comes in, purple and scarlet, (Rev. xvii. 4) and muslin, and embroidered silk, (Rev. xviii. 12) gilded garments, robes of changing red and yellow, golden robes, robes of pure white, of violet, of lemon; white miters, colored miters, gilded miters; stars, ribbons and plumes; ecclesiastical, courtly, military adornments, flashing steel, clattering muskets; *then borne aloft*, two great fans of ostrich feathers, with a peacock feather *eye* upon the top of each; and then, *in the air*, the towering *tiara*, with its three circlets, one for the kingly office, another for the priestly, the third for the union of the priestly, kingly and imperial. It moves, above helmets, halberds and plumes, aloft toward the vault of the nave, gliding slowly along; over it a moving canopy of silk, borne on golden staves. . . the old hand holding itself out, and blessing with the two fingers. . . .”

That the whole of this pageantry is heathen anyone conversant with the question knows. Mr. Arthur recognized it at once. It is singular, however, how small points of identity crop up unexpectedly. In Dr. Cunningham Geike’s learned “The Holy Land and the Bible,” on page 27, is an engraving of the Fish-God, Dagon, from a bas-relief at Khorsabad. It shows a man whose lower extremities are fish-like. On his head is a tiara—and his right arm is extended, like the Pope’s, in the act of blessing. This attitude is invariably adopted by Popes when publicly and officially “blessing.” “As if,” Mr. Arthur remarks, “there were some mystic power in the motion, and a moment must not be lost in conferring the benefits of it upon all around.” It is the attitude of *fraudulent Divinity*, “showing by acts that he is God”—for who can “bless,” but God?

Mr. Arthur says: “The portative (portable) throne is a magnificent chair set upon a litter, such as a high priest in India may sometimes be seen borne upon by his disciples . . . ; and then at last you see, under this moving pageant, eight men, clothed in deep crimson, bearers of the Vice-God. The gliding canopy, the flashing crown, the smiling face, the thrice gorgeous robes, the rich chair, the moving litter, the crimson men, the golden poles, the prostrate helmets and plumes, the flash, flash, flash of steel; the curious, or scrutinizing, or shocked, or half-adoring glances of so many eyes; altogether, it is a wonderful scene! What is meant by the ceremony? “The procession represents the Apostles and Disciples passing into Galilee to meet the Savior; but with still higher meaning, *the King of Glory proceeding with the assembly of ransomed spirits from Hades into the realms of bliss . . .*” (see “Lent and the Holy Week in Rome,” by C. J. Hemans, p. 163). The Pope is acting the “King of Glory entering Paradise”! “showing himself by acts as God,” as foretold.\*

\*As the true Christ is God therefore the Vice-Christ claims to be God. In the Canon Law the Pope is also called God (Decretum Gregorii XIII. Distine 96 Car 7); and also “Lord and God” (Decretales Gregorii IX. Tit 7). Innocent III., in his Decretals, said of the Pope: “God because he is God’s Vicar.” The Sacrum Ceremoniale says: “The Apostolic Chair is the Seat of God.” Benedict XIII was styled “Vice-God” The Canon Law and Decretals are styled by Papal writers the Pope’s “Oracle.”

Mr. Hemans gives the following explanation of the two Peacock Fans or Flabelli: “The mystic import attached to them is, that as the eyes of peacocks’ feathers are set in the ostrich plumes, *vigilance as of many eyes* is required from the Pontiff, that he may ever watch for the good of the Catholic Commonwealth. . . .” (Arthur, p. 372).

Here, then, is the fulfillment of another item in the prophetic delineation of the Antichrist, for, in Daniel vii. 8, he is described as having “*eyes like the eyes of a man*, and a mouth speaking great things,” i.e., as an EPISKOPOS, or Overseer, over the ten-horned or “Catholic ” Commonwealth or Latino-Roman Power.

As to the import of the throne, the same authority says: “In this ELEVATION of the Person of the Pontiff is implied that the Vicar of Christ is the Center to which the eyes of the faithful should turn, as to a Beacon-Light on high, for their guidance and consolation!”

What awful blasphemy! “Showing himself by act as God.”

Here is more self-exaltation, mingled with blasphemy: “After the Pope has gone back to his throne, the host and the chalice are solemnly carried down from the altar along the floor, then up the steps of the throne. Here he is seated in the temple of God—he above it, it below; his crown at this moment upon the altar, his enthroned person higher than the sacrament. While others kneel and prostrate themselves to receive it, it is handed to him seated upon his throne. Seated, he takes the host; seated, the chalice from men upon their knees; . . . Consecrated particles are presented to him by kneeling men, and he distributes them from that throne to the angels in white, and red, and gold, and purple, and embroidery, and they again to those who are kneeling around him After this, the Pontiff again puts on the triple crown, again seats himself on the portative throne, and the chief Priest of St. Peter’s presents him with a purse of white velvet, containing the fee for saying Mass” (Arthur, p. 370) Remember that the “*throne*” referred to is above what Papists call “the altar of God.”

It is on this that are laid the diadems of the Pope; it is on this that the Pope performs Mass—pretending to create God out of a wafer; it is *above* this that the Pope sits on his “throne”—conveying to the looker-on the idea of God on earth.

Add to this self-exaltation the appalling ceremonial of the “Adoration of the Pope,” as given in Picart, where he is “adored” no less than five times in succession by cardinals in red and in purple, the first time when seated on his “portative throne” before “the altar”; the second time when seated on “the altar”; the third time when seated on “the great altar”—cardinals kissing his foot and right hand, followed by foreign ambassadors; the fourth time when seated in a “throne” under the portico; the fifth time when seated on his usual “throne”—where all the cardinals “adore” him, along with all the clergy; add to this the disgusting way in which the head Cardinal-Deacon and other cardinals kiss the Pope’s *stomach*, whilst patriarchs, archbishops and bishops kiss his *foot* and *knee*, and abbots and penitentiaries kiss his *knee* only; and we reach a state of super-human self-exaltation as derogatory to man as it is insulting to God in whose name it is all done. It is “*against all that is called God.*” Remember, that to Papists the Pyx (a small round container used to carry the Eucharist) contains “il buon Dio”—the good God—that it usually stands on the high altar of St. Peter’s, the very place on which the Pope seats himself to be “adored”; and is only removed to allow him to occupy its place, and is then generally put on the floor out of the way. So that *literally* the Pope exalts himself “above all that is (by Papists) called God”; and this in more senses than one—for the Catechism of the Council of Trent declares that “*bishops and priests are rightly called Gods.*”

When you remember where the Pope is seated, how he is adored, and what it all represents, do you not recognize the “Man of Sin” showing himself that he is God, and exalting himself “above all that is called god,” as well as “against”?

Dr. Ward Beecher, in “Papal Conspiracy Exposed” (p. 317), said: “It has kept no terms with humanity; humanity should keep no terms with it. It has kept no terms with God; and God will assuredly keep no terms with it. It has impiously usurped His place on earth. All common blasphemy disappears and is forgotten in comparison with the blasphemy of the Popes and their insensate worshipers. They have not only claimed power as God, but above God, and against God; and let the nations be assured that he will not hold them guiltless for ever. The day of His judgment hastens; it is at hand!”

The Romish Vulgate of Pope Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. has: “who opposeth and is *lifted up* above all that is called God, or that is revered (*colitur*), so that he sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself as if he were God.” “Lifted up” is “*extollitur.*”

As a fact, the Pope is lifted up in the *Sedia Gestatoria*, above all bishops and priests, who, by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, are “called gods.”

It is also a fact that the wafer is called “God” by the Council of Trent, and by all Papists, and to it is the worship *Latria* rendered (Session XIII, Canons I. and VI., and chapters i. and v.).

It is also a fact that the Pope is “lifted up”\* above the wafer God on the “altar.” and when thus seated, the Pyx is on the floor below him.

It is also a fact that the official Petrine Throne of the Pope in St. Peter’s is high above the “altar” in the Tribune.

Hence 2 Thess ii. 4 is literally fulfilled in three physical ways by the Popes of Rome, in addition to several spiritual ways.

\* In his “Temporal Power,” P. 50, Cardinal Manning wrote: “He was ELEVATED to be in his Divine Master’s name, King of Kings, and Lord of Lord’s.

## Appendix D. Rev. XIII. 16-18 Fulfilled

THE False Christian Priesthood (Matt. vii. 15) was to be coadjutor to, and helper of, the Antichrist or “The Beast”; and one of the means he would use, in order to further the cause of the Antichrist is thus described: “He causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or on their foreheads.”

There is no mistaking this. It means a symbol of faith imposed by a false Christian Priesthood in order to render the recipients the subjects of The Beast or The Antichrist. As The Beast is of Pagan origin—for “Wild Beast” is ever the symbol of a Pagan Power—and the False Priesthood is also of Pagan origin, it is sufficiently obvious that the “mark” imposed is also of Pagan origin.

We are therefore to seek for a Pagan symbol imposed as a symbol of the Christian Faith, by a False Christian Priesthood, upon all—irrespective of quality or condition; and this with the object of making all the recipients the subjects of the False Priesthood’s Master—The Antichrist. The *right hand*, and the *forehead*, were to be the two parts of the human body affected by this religious symbol.

In 1906 Pope Pius X. issued a “Compendium of Christian Doctrine,” which, he declared, “expounds clearly the Holy Faith, which all Christians must observe.” To the question “What is the sign of a Christian?” the reply is given: “The sign of a Christian is the sign of the Holy Cross.”

To the further question, “How do you make the sign of the Cross?” the answer is: I make the sign of the Cross, placing the RIGHT HAND to the FOREHEAD, saying: “In the Name of the Father”; then to the breast, saying, “And of the Son”; then to the left shoulder and to the right shoulder, saying, “And of the Holy Spirit”; and lastly I say “Amen.”

To the question, “Why is the Sign of the Cross the sign of a Christian?” the reply given is . . . “because it serves to *distinguish Christians from infidels.*”

To the question, “What does the Sign of the Cross indicate?” the reply given is, “It indicates the principal mysteries of our holy faith.” And then the recipient of this sign is told that as it “possesses the merit of reviving faith, banishing temptation, and of obtaining much grace from God, it is right to make the Sign of the Cross when getting up in the morning, when going to bed at night, before and after meals and work, on entering or leaving a church, and especially before prayer.” It will be seen, therefore, that every class, and all ages, are included; rich and poor, bond and free. All have to make the Sign of the Cross with the *right hand* to the *forehead*, in order to show that they are followers of the Pope—for it is the Pope’s “Holy Faith” which, throughout this Catechism, is passed off as Christianity. Into this “holy faith” one is admitted by “holy baptism” and by “holy baptism” is meant the rite performed by “a Priest” who, with his RIGHT HAND, makes the “Sign of the Cross” on the FOREHEAD of the infant. From that moment it is obligatory on the recipient to observe the Law of the Church”—i.e., of the Pope’s Church or False Priesthood.

The Council of Trent decreed (Session vii., Canon ix.) that in baptism there is imprinted in the soul . . . a certain spiritual and indelible sign,” thus terrorizing all into being baptized. The Council of Trent was a gathering of sham Christian Priests.

The Roman Ritual or office-book of the Priesthood of Rome prescribes how baptism is to be performed. It lays down that “the lawful minister of baptism is the Parish Priest,” who “with his thumb shall make the Sign of the Cross on the FOREHEAD . . .” of the baptized.

The “Cross” thus made is a notorious and well-known Pagan emblem, the oldest in symbolism. I need not elaborate that point now, as I have proved it to the hilt elsewhere. It suffices at present to add that the Pope claims all baptized persons as his subjects. (The Pope and the Council, p. 165; also the Canonist Kirchenrecht, 1855-1872. )

It will thus be seen, by any unprejudiced person, that in order to compel rich and poor, bond and free, to become subjects of the Pope, the priests of Rome teach that by baptism the soul is indelibly marked for eternity, when a mark is impressed with the Right Hand to the Forehead in the form of a Cross (Pontificale Romanum, p. 49.)—the oldest and most universal Pagan symbol. All who decline to accept this ordeal are refused the name of “Christian,” and are relegated to the ranks of “infidels”!

“Innocent XI., A.D. 1680, struck a medal showing the Church of Rome as a Woman standing at Rome, holding in her left hand a LATIN CROSS, and in her right hand a cup containing the wafer, with the legend “In Saeculum Stabit.”

Leo XII, 1825, struck one showing a Woman seated on the globe, with a LATIN CROSS in her left hand, and a cup in her right band, with the legend “Sedet Super Universam.”

Gregory XIII., 1572, struck one showing an angel with a sword in the right hand, and a CROSS in the other, in honor of St. Bartholomew’s massacre.

And in this manner is the “more sure word of prophecy” fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit revealed to John on Patmos more than 1,800 years ago, so clearly that he may run who reads it.

The Bull “Unam Sanctam” declares it essential to salvation to be subject to the Pope; accordant with which claim all Papal ecclesiastics take the vow of “obedience,” and receive the Sign of the Cross, as a sign of fealty to the Pope; and these in turn administer to Emperors, and Kings, and to all within the Church of Rome, the oath of spiritual allegiance to the Pope, along with the Sign of the Cross, which is impressed upon all FOREHEADS or hands, with the RIGHT HANDS of the operators—even as a great army of soldiers under the Papal banner—from birth to death.

Yet there are intelligent Englishmen who are blind to this evident fulfillment, and are looking for something quite different still to come. Thus is Wisdom justified of her children!

## **Appendix E. Romish Truth and Celibacy**

One of the late Cardinal Bourne’s entourage, once wrote to the Press stating that the feelings of Papists had been harrowed by a newspaper report of a meeting of priests at Naples, at which a resolution had been passed demanding the abolition of priestly celibacy. This report was, of course, declared to be untrue—*ça va sans dire* (it goes without saying). But I have taken the trouble to institute inquiries at Naples and elsewhere in Italy, and I find, as I expected, that the report was true in substance, though not correctly expressed. I have before me an Italian journal published at Florence. It contains an article by the Senator ex-priest Romolo Murri, entitled “A Cry of Anguish.” It deals with the subject of priestly celibacy as viewed by ex-military priests who had recently held a meeting at Milan, on purpose to demand “the abolition of the obligatory celibacy of Romish priests.” Murri was directly appealed to by these to interest himself in this matter, and he says in his

article that “probably these are the same that published in the Press an appeal on the same subject, as was dealt with by *Qui quondam* in the April number of the Roman Review Bilychnis.”

Commenting on this article, the Editor of the journal said: “A great stir was made at Rome by the notice, published at the end of March by a popular morning journal, that at a meeting of priests at Naples there was ventilated the question of the abolition of obligatory celibacy, and of the vow of chastity: and this at once provoked lively and instant protests and denials at the Vatican.”

As a fact the Naples meeting took place. It had been duly authorized. *Therefore no official* resolution against celibacy could be passed by it. But the subject was most certainly mooted, and numbers of those present were in favor of it. Indeed it cannot be denied, even by the Vatican official prevarication, that there exists at Naples a secret organization the priests—who are opposed to celibacy; and that this question was discussed very fully in a Review and pamphlets, by Professor Gennaro Avolio; and that copious literature is at this very moment circulating throughout Italy, especially in Southern Italy, where the matter affects the priesthood very severely.

A movement against celibacy was actually founded with its headquarters in Naples. A large number of priests joined it, as shown by a referendum made by Avolio, and its echoes have reached as far as Rome. Many members of this organization attended the authorized meeting at Naples, and there is no doubt that these entered into a deliberate propaganda. No sooner was this discovered than the Cardinal Archbishop Prisco fulminated against the movement, the Vatican rose in arms, and denials were plentifully showered. But the fact remains, that at the Naples meeting—and unofficially — under the very noses of the authorities, celibacy was not only mooted, but discussed, and its abolition recommended by numbers of priests.

In France and Czechoslovakia the priests followed suit.

## Appendix F. The False Prophet

THE Word of God warned the early Christians to expect an apostasy, or sliding away, from primitive truth; which apostasy was at work in Paul’s days, but was restrained for a time by the then regnant power of the Caesars. On the removal of this hindrance to complete development, there would be revealed, within the professing Christian body, a class of men opposing, and exalting itself against, all mundane powers and objects of reverence, insomuch that it should actually put forth claims to divinity. It was to foster celibacy and fasting. In the Apocalypse this class of man is styled “The False Prophet,” in outward appearance lamb-like, inwardly and in speech anti-Christian and intolerant, as well as self-exalting and blasphemous. In the present day this class of men are conspicuous by their arrogant claims and immense self-exaltation—though it is the fashion amongst politicians, pressmen, and society people to regard them all as “earnest and devoted workers” in the cause of Christ, thus adding insult to injury.

Let me just give a few instances of this self-exaltation, and then let well-meaning but unthinking neo-evangelicals ask themselves whether “The False Prophet” is not in their midst, masquerading as a lamb?\*

\* Hermes condemns the “false prophet” of his own day (2nd cent.), “who, seemingly to have the spirit, exalts himself and would fain have the first seat” (Lightfoot, on “The Christian Ministry,” p. 219).

(1) “The Canonized Saint” Liguori, whose published works have been declared by the Papacy to be without cause of censure, in his “Selva,” declares that “the priest of God is exalted above all earthly

sovereignities and above all celestial heights”; and that “the death of Christ has been necessary to institute the priesthood,” not “to save the world.” (Ed. What a horrible lie!)

(2) “The priest,” says Liguori, “has the power of delivering sinners from hell, of making them worthy of Paradise, and of changing them from slaves of Satan into children of God. And God Himself is obliged to abide by the judgment of His priests.”

(3) “If the Person of the Redeemer had not as yet been in the world, the priest, by pronouncing the words of consecration, would produce this great Person of a Man-God.”

(4) “Hence, priests are called the parents of Jesus Christ. For they are the active cause by which He is made to exist . . . thus the priest may . . . be called the Creator of his Creator.’

(5) “Who is it that has an arm like the arm of God, and thunders with a voice like the thundering Voice of God? It is the priest.”

(6) Canon Doyle, parish priest of Arthurstown, in 1895, published in “The People,” of Wexford, “The Dignity of the Priesthood,” in which he repeated Liguori’s dicta, and added a few others. Thus he declares that “he who insults a priest, insults Christ”; that “by a single mass he gives greater honor to God than all the angels and saints have or shall give”; that “in obedience to the words of priests God Himself comes whenever they call Him, and as often as they call Him, and places Himself in their hands, even though they should be His enemies.” “Having come, He remains entirely at their disposal; they move Him as they please, from one place to another; they may, if they wish, shut him up in the tabernacle, or expose Him on the altar, or carry Him outside the church. They may, if they choose, eat His flesh, and give Him for the food of others.” “The sacerdotal dignity is the most noble of all dignities in the world. The power of the priest extends to spiritual goods, and to the human soul. The kings of the earth glory in honoring priests. They willingly bend their knee before the priest. They kiss his hands. The dignity of the priesthood surpasses even that of the angels. The word of the priest created Jesus Christ. The priesthood is called the Seat of the Saints. Priests hold the place of Jesus Christ on earth. Priests are the representatives of the Person of God on earth. What God alone can do by His omnipotence, the priest can also do.”

The “Very Reverend Father Provincial,” of the C.S.S.R., preaching at the Church of the Most Precious Blood, Edmonton, said: “Day by day, as Holy Mass was said, Jesus Christ came down upon the Altar in hundreds and thousands of Churches just as truly as He did on the first Christmas morning” (“Catholic Times,” 3-3-1905).

Father J. Furniss, C.S.S.A., in “God and His Creatures.” *Permissu Superiorum*, under “The First Communion” (p. 556), says: “See that child. In three minutes the Lord God Almighty, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, will be in that child.”

Cardinal Mercier defined the Papacy as “the accepted and cherished supremacy of one Conscience over all other Consciences, of one Will over all other Wills” (see Rev. xiii. 12).

(7) In a sermon preached by a Bavarian priest named Kinzelmann, in 1872, he said: “We priests stand as far above the emperors, kings, and princes as the heaven is above the earth. Angels and Archangels stand beneath us. We occupy a position superior to that of the Mother of God. Yea, . . . we stand above God—Who must always serve us.” “Church History,” by Professor J. H. Kurtz, 1893, vol. iii. p. 248.)

(8) A priest named Gregory preached a sermon in Chicago in 1912, in which he said: “I cannot exaggerate the power and dignity of the priest. . . . His power is greater than that of an angel. His dignity is greater than that of Mary, the Queen of angels.” “At the altar his is not inferior to that of God.” “No power of man is equal to this. . . It must be the power of God.” (“Toronto Sentinel,” 6th June, 1912).

(9) At Quebec a priest preached a sermon in which he said “the priest reproduces Jesus Christ.” “The priest— bearing . . . a power that makes him the equal of God” (“The Christian,” 24th September, 1914).

(10) Priest Phelan—then editor of a Popish newspaper—in 1915 preached a sermon containing the following: “I never invite an angel down from Heaven to hear Mass. The only Person in Heaven I ever ask to come down here is Jesus Christ, and Him I command to come down. He has to come when I bid Him” (“American Citizen,” 31st July, 1915).

(11) The “Christian World” of 18th September, 1913, gave some extracts from a Romish work published in Germany, and written by a priest: “Priests . . . possess supernatural position and power. Even the angels bow before them. Christ would rather permit the world to perish than that the celibacy of the clergy should be abolished.”

(12) The same paper quoted a book by the Cardinal Archbishop of Salzburg, in which the following language is used:— “One may even speak of the omnipotence of the priest, of *an omnipotence which is beyond that of God Himself*.” (Ed. It’s so shocking that anyone could think this! It came straight from Satan.)

(13) At the funeral of a priest in Quebec on November 2nd, 1915, “Father” Connolly said: “The priest is another Christ, and his work is to continue the great work of the Redemption.”

#### SUPREME WICKEDNESS—WORSE THAN MURDER.

(14) “In an address to Roman Catholics at Spokane, Washington, ‘Father’ George Maloney, speaking on ‘The Duty of Catholics,’ said: ‘If the precepts of the Church are not kept, the children cannot hope to be saved, for God punishes more severely the disobedience of the rules of the Church than He does the transgressions of His own commandments. It is the experience of every priest that it is harder to seek repentance for those who break the precepts of the Church than for these who break the commandments. *It is easier to get forgiveness for one who commits murder than for one who misses Mass on Sunday or eats meat on Friday.*” —(“Review,” Spokane, Washington, April 18th, 1913.).

(15) In a sermon preached at the Brompton Oratory on January 1st, 1860, the Rev. F. W. Faber, D.D., said that Christ is still on Earth in the Pope. “The Sovereign Pontiff is a Third Visible Presence of Jesus amongst us. In the Person of His Vicar. . . . we may draw near to Jesus.” (“Devotion to the Pope,” dedicated to Rev. E. Hearn, D.D., Vicar-General; published by Richardson.).

(16) Aquinas (xxxiv. Ed. Paris. xx. 549-580) says: “There is no difference between the Pope and Jesus Christ.”

(17) James’ “Church History,” p. 282: “Tolomeo begins by saying that Christ was the first Pope.”

#### PRIESTLY BLASPHEMY.



(18) “Between God in Heaven and man upon earth stands the priest, who, being both God and man, combines both natures, and forms the connecting link. ... I, as priest, do not follow in rank the cherubim and seraphim in the administration of the universe. I stand high above them. For they are God’s servants. We (priests), however, are God’s coadjutors ... I fulfill three exalted functions towards the God of our altars. I summon Him to earth, I give Him to men... without your (priest’s) permission. He may not move; He cannot bless without your co-operation; nor can He give grace except through our hands. Behold yonder man only 25 years old. Soon he will go through the sanctuary to meet the sinners who await His coming; He is the God of this earth, which He purifies.”

(“The Manresa of the Priest,” by “Father” Couxtte, ex-Vicar- General of Toulouse, see “Literary Digest,” October, 1897, pp. 28 to 57.).

(19) The Curé d’Ars, a Memoir of Jean Baptiste Marie Viauncy, London, 1869, p. 121, by Georgina Molyneux: “Consider the power of the priesthood! Out of a piece of bread the priest’s tongue can make a God. That is a greater act than the creation of a world... Someone said: St. Philomena obeys the Curé d’Ars! Certainly she may obey him, since God obeys him. If I met a priest and an angel, I would salute the priest before the angel. The latter is the friend of God, but the priest holds His place.”

(20) “Our Sunday Visitor,” September 24th, 1922, contained an advertisement by a Popish priest, named, “Rev. A. J. Halbleib, of the Sacred Heart Church.” Deauville, Virginia, asking people to send “a dollar, more or less, once or oftener” in order to “insure your own soul—and the souls nearest and dearest to you—against final loss by fire and at the same time help . . .’the work of starting the (R.) Catholic Church . . . in a vast section of the south, where it is still almost unknown.”

#### MASS AND ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

(21) Admittedly a sentence from a brief report of a fifty minutes’ lecture, “taken simply as it stands,” does not express a complete theology of the Eucharist in its sacrificial aspects. The sentence contrasted the Mass with the traditional Eucharistic doctrine of Communion in the Anglican Reformed Church, and summed up that difference in the fact that *the Mass offers Christ as a Divine Victim really present* under the Eucharistic veils on an earthly altar, while the traditional Anglican theology does not express this oblation. I am quite aware that the modern Anglo-Catholic theology has returned to the Catholic concept of the offering of Christ’s Body and Blood on the earthly altar, but my lecture was chiefly occupied in proving that this is not the traditional theology of Anglicanism.—Rev. F. Woodlock, S.J., Farm Street Church.—(“Times,” 20/6/27.)

## Appendix G. The Primacy of Peter.

Papists subscribe to the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and promise not “to take and interpret them (the Scriptures) otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers” —i.e., to moonshine, for “the Fathers” never agreed on a single text.

In the speech prepared for, but not permitted by, the Vatican Council of 1869-70, Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, —who afterwards published it in Naples, denied that Petrine claims to the Primacy could be made out—by Scripture—precisely because of the above clause in Pius IV.’s Creed obliging Papists to interpret Scripture only “according to the unanimous consent of the

Fathers.” He gave the following statistics showing that no less than Five different interpretations of Matthew xvi. 18 are given by “the Fathers”:

- (1) That the Church is built on Peter is taught by seventeen Fathers;
- (2) That the Rock is the whole body of the Apostles is held by eight Fathers;
- (3) That the Rock is the Faith confessed by Peter is held by forty-four Fathers;
- (4) That the Rock is Christ is held by sixteen;
- (5) that the Rock includes all the faithful-living stones of which the Church is built. Kenrick says “a few” held this.

Whence Archbishop Kenrick asserted that: “If we are bound to follow the greater number of the Fathers, then we must hold for certain that the word PETRA means, not Peter but the Faith professed by Peter.” (“Church Quarterly Review,” July, 1881, p. 545.)

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo (died 430), before Conversion (A.D. 387), was Professor of Rhetoric. The Roman Church venerates his writings. He sometimes interpreted the Rock to mean Peter, and sometimes to mean Christ. In his “Retractions” (*lib.* 1) he said: “I have said in a certain passage, respecting the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded upon him as a rock . . . but know that I have frequently afterwards so explained myself that the phrase, ‘upon the Rock,’ should be understood to be the Rock which Peter confessed.”

Another learned doctor of the Roman Church, “Father Lannay,” Censor of works, 1643, gives seventy extracts from “Fathers,” in which Peter is spoken of as The Rock; eight in which the Church is said to have been built upon *all* the Apostles; forty-four state that the faith Peter confessed was the Rock; sixteen that Christ was the Rock. (Lannoi. Opera. tom. v., Part II., p. 99: Epist. vii. lib. v.)

It will be noticed that this Jesuit substitutes seventy for seventeen, but agrees with Archbishop Kenrick in the remaining figures! Like Kenrick, he says that “a few Fathers held the Rock to be the faithful.” Kenrick was an honest and sincere man. Can the same be said of any Ultramontane Jesuit?

## APPENDIX H. “Killing No Murder.”

In all the Sinn Fein troubles in Ireland there was one question which the British Government did not face openly. That was in regard to the responsibility of the Roman hierarchy for the conditions there. Roman prelates not only condoned crime but, through the official church publications, they encouraged rebellion and taught the doctrine that killing is not murder provided the killing is done for political purposes. If the political parties should have endorsed that doctrine there would be lively times indeed during general and other election campaigns. The Roman Church authorities in Ireland were directly responsible for the promulgation of that doctrine and the facts ought to have been made known by the British Government, relations with the Vatican severed and the publishers indicted, This reasonable demand was made at the time in an article in the “London Spectator.”

The Irish Roman Catholic Primate and his Censor allowed, and so became responsible for, the publication of an article in the Irish Theological Quarterly, published by the Authorities of Maynooth, which in effect made killing no murder in Ireland, provided the killing was done for political objects and by those who had declared that Ireland was in a state of war with Great Britain.

The British Government should, therefore, have taken the matter up and made the whole of Europe ring with it. Parliament should have condemned this doctrine as set forth under the imprimatur of the Irish Roman Catholic Primate, and the next step should have been to instruct our diplomatic agent at the Vatican to inquire whether or not the doctrine laid down and published with a *non obstat* and an Archiepiscopal imprimatur in Dublin was endorsed by the Holy See. This, we venture to say, the Vatican would never admit. Nor, again, would it refuse to give any answer. If the authorities had said the matter was subject to investigation in the Curia, then the British Government should have plainly said that they would be bound to suspend official relations with the Roman Church till she had made up her mind on the point so momentous as whether the Papacy allows its chief ecclesiastics to sanction the publication of condonations of murder such as that issued under the imprimatur of the Roman Primate in Ireland in the article in the Irish Theological Quarterly.

Such proclamation as already mentioned was not an isolated one. Possibly this is best seen by citing the case of Mr. Charles Diamond, Editor of the London Catholic Herald, a man of position and education, who wrote an article in his journal headed “Killing —No Murder.” “Lord French,” he says, “has escaped this time: will he always escape?” Then this Roman Catholic journalist added, “Killing is no murder when it is the other fellow who is to be killed.” There was much more of a like nature, all inciting to murder and outrage.

That this teaching is acted upon by Romish agents is proved by the “New Zealand Sentinel” of October 1923, p. 8. which contained a “Felonious Record of Knights of Columba” in the United States, since 1913. It included two murderous assaults on ex-Priest Crowley in 1913, and fourteen other assaults on Protestants.

## **APPENDIX I. THE PAPACY IS THE ANTICHRIST.**

(1) The Translators of the Authorized Version of 1611 added an “Address” to King James I., in which they described the Papacy as “*the Man of Sin.*” They were all learned and pious men, who knew History and the Bible.

(2) The Reformers and Martyrs who were burnt alive in Queen Mary’s reign were also learned men. They wrote the “Homilies” or Sermons which are mentioned at the end of the 39 Articles. The Third Part of the Homily against Peril of Idolatry (p. 243) cites Dan. xi. 38 as relating to Antichrist and Popery; at p. 245 it speaks of “the Kingdom of Antichrist,” and quotes Matt. xxiv. 24, 2 Thess. ii. 9-12, Rev. xiii. 13, 14. The Second part of the Sermon for Whit Sunday denounces the Roman Church as not a true Church of Christ, and the Pope as Antichrist—citing Gregory I.’s Epistles 76-78, lib. iv. The Third Part of the Homily against the Peril of Idolatry, p. 292, calls Rome “the idolatrous church,” “a foul, filthy, old, withered harlot,” “the great strumpet (harlot) of all strumpets,” of Rev. xviii., xvii.

### **REVIEW.**

THE ANTICHRIST: His PORTRAIT AND History. By Baron Porcelli. Pp. 116. Protestant Truth Society.

This is a comparatively small book, but it should not be thought unimportant on that account. It deals with a great subject in an able and interesting manner. Evidently in considering the question of the “Antichrist” the actual meaning of the term is a matter of the greatest consequence. This is our author’s first point. Although his space is limited, yet his references to the original of the New Testament are ample, and he supports his contention with numerous and well-chosen quotations. In our opinion he is fully justified in his conclusion that the “Antichrist of prophecy is a false Christian, a veiled enemy of Christ, of heathen origin. He is not only the outcome of the Great Apostasy, but is consummated Head, its apostolic Head, its false Apostle or ‘son of perdition.’” Anyone, however, who doubts this conclusion or requires proof should carefully examine the arguments by which it is preceded and sustained. Succeeding chapters on the “characteristics” of Antichrist, the time of his appearance, the duration of his power, his local connection with Rome, and his actual identification also call for attentive study. They are not merely assertions or repetitions of hackneyed statements; they are reasoned expositions of their theme displaying a large amount of learning which ought to command the respect even of those whose views may be different from those of the writer. Chapter VII. on “Antichrist revealed by chain of evidence” displays in a remarkable manner the pains which Baron Porcelli took to compile and arrange his arguments and facts before committing them to print. It is a veritable storehouse of quotations culled from a wide field, manifesting wonderful patience in their collection as well as skill in their application. It will well repay perusal. Indeed, no one desiring to be well-informed upon the subject can possibly neglect it.

Two things may be specially noted about this book. It is written throughout from the standpoint of the historical school of interpretation. It is frankly anti-papal, because it sees the papacy described and condemned in the Word of God. In the second place, it gives supreme honor to the Bible. There it finds the only real test of doctrine, the final court of appeal. To quote from the author’s preface, “The condition of Christendom today is such as to cause serious alarm and distress to thoughtful minds, owing to the multiplicity of ‘isms,’ which very often read plausibly, but *au fond* are sadly erroneous, owing to lack of care in observation and study; and not less often owing to hasty acceptance of theories which have no basis in truth. ‘To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them.’” We earnestly commend this book to our readers, hoping that its value will be fully recognized in these remarkable and solemn days.—*English Churchman*.

THE END

---

The Antichrist: His Portrait and History by Baron Porcelli was a gift of a paperback book sent to me, James Arendt, by Mr. Ron Bullock of [Old Working Books & Bindery](http://www.oldworkingbooks.com). Because it was not available in text online, I felt led by the Lord to scan it and convert the scanned image into text using optical character recognition software (Tesseract) on my Fedora OS and then proofread the extracted text. It took from from August 12 till August 31, 19 days of daily work! It was a labor of love which I was happy to do because this book is the best and most exhaustive on the subject of Antichrist that I ever ever read!

Please share this PDF file far and wide! Consider it in the Public Domain. You can also read it in sections from my website: [www.jamesjpn.net](http://www.jamesjpn.net) The full URL is <https://www.jamesjpn.net/eschatology/the-antichrist-his-portrait-and-history/>

