by dividing off Pagan from Christ  
Primarily, this second beast plainly sets  
forth the Pagan sacerdotal power ; this it  
was that made the image of the Emperors,  
that compelled Christians to worship that  
image, that wrought signs and wonders by  
its omensand magic. But as the first beast,  
still subsisting, has passed into a so-called  
Christian Roman Empire, so has the second  
beast into a so-called Christian priesthood,  
the veritable inheritor of pagan rites,images,  
and superstitions; actually the continuators,  
under a different name, of the same worship  
in the same places; that of the Virgin for  
that of Venus, Cosmas and Damian for  
Romulus and Remus, the image of Peter  
for that of Jupiter Tonans: lamb-like in  
profession, with the names and appearances  
of Christianity, but dragon-like in word  
and And this was surely never more  
strikingly shewn than at the times when I  
am writing, when the Papal priesthood  
is zealously combining in the suicidal act  
of upholding the temporal power, as necesary to the spiritual pre-eminence of their  
“Lord God the Pope.” So that I believe  
the interpretation of the second beast to be,  
the *sacerdotal persecuting power, pagan  
and Christian*, as the first is the secular  
persecuting power, pagan or Christian. I  
conceive the view which would limit it to  
the priesthood of Paganism quite insufficient for the importance of the prophecy;  
while that of Elliott, &c., which would limit  
it to the priesthood of the Papacy, fails  
notably in giving a meaning to its acts as  
here described, the making an image to the  
beast and causing men to worship it. {11} **And  
saw another wild-beast coming up out  
of the earth** (see the preceding note), **and  
it had two horns like a lamb** (i.e. like the  
two horns of a lamb: see ref. It is quite  
  
true that the absence of the definite article  
before the word **lamb** forbids the idea that  
a direct comparison is intended between  
this lamb-like beast, and the Lamb on  
Mount Sion: but it does not follow from  
this that no reference is made to that  
Lamb in the choice of the animal to which  
this beast is compared. I believe tho  
choice is made to set forth the hybrid  
character of this second beast: see more  
below, The *number* may perhaps he of no  
special import, but merely inserted to complete the similarity: it, as a lamb has,  
had two horns), **and it spoke as a dragon**(here again, we cannot doubt that the term  
is chosen on account of the dragon which  
has been before mentioned. It is no objection to this, that we do not hear of that  
dragon speaking: the character of the  
animal explains what kind of speech is  
meant, and the. acts of the dragon were  
of that kind. And as to this second beast,  
though its appearance and profession are  
sacerdotal, its words and acts are devilish.  
‘The whole description strongly recalls. to  
our mind our Lord’s warning, “Beware of  
false prophets which come unto you in  
sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are  
ravening wolves,” Matt. vii. 15). {12} **And  
it worketh all the power** (performs all  
the acts of authority) **of the first beast in  
his presence** (while the first beast is subsisting and beholding ; and as the expression seems to shew, being in a relation to it  
of serving and upholding), **and maketh the  
earth and those that dwell in it to worship the first beast, whose wound of  
death was healed** (this was formerly,  
ver. 4, described as the reason why the  
world wondered after the former beast)  
{13} **and worketh great miracles, so that** (it is  
notorious enough that the great arm of