confiscate her possessions: or perhaps, as  
the same expression, Ps. xxvii, 2; Micah  
ili. 2 ff, where it is used to indicate the  
extreme vengeance of keen hostility), **and  
shall consume her with** (**in**) **fire** (Düsterdieck remarks that in the former clause  
the figure of a *woman* is kept: in this  
latter the thing signified, a *city*. But this  
need not absolutely be: the woman may  
be here also intended: and all the more  
probably, because the very words **shall  
consume her with fire** are quoted from the  
legal formula of the condemnation of those  
who had committed abominable fornications: see Levit. xx. 14, xxi. 9. The  
burning of the city would be a signal fulfilment : but we cannot positively say that  
that, and nothing else is intended). {17} **For  
God put it** (anticipatory past tense) **into  
their hearts to do His mind, and to make  
one mind, and to give their kingdom** (i.e.,  
as above, the authority of their respective  
kingdoms) **unto the beast, until the words  
of God shall be fulfilled** (the prophetic  
words or discourses, respecting the destruction of Babylon), {18} **And the woman  
whom thou sawest, is the great city, which  
hath kingdom over the kings of the earth**(every thing here is plain, The “city on  
seven hills which rules the world,” can be  
but one, and that one ROME. The present:  
tense, **which hath**, points to the time when  
the words were uttered, and to the dominion then subsisting. It has already been  
seen, that the prophecy regards Rome  
pagan and papal, but, from the figure of  
an harlot and the very nature of the predictions themselves, more the latter than  
the former. I may observe in passing,  
that the view maintained recently by Düsterdieck, after many others, that the whole  
of these prophecies regard pagan Rome  
only, receives no countenance from the  
words of this verse, which this school of Commentators are fond of appealing to as  
decisive for them. Rather may we say that  
this verse, taken in connexion with what has  
gone before, stultifies their view entirely.  
If the woman, as these Commentators insist, represents merely the stone-walls and  
houses of the city, what need is there for  
mystery on her brow,—what appropriateness in the use of all the Scripture imagery, long familiar to God’s people, of spiritual fornication? Aud if this were so,  
where is the contest with the Lamb,—  
where the fulfilment of any the least portion of the prophecy? If we understand  
it thus, nothing is left us but to say, as indeed some of this school are not afraid to  
say, that only the Seer’s wish dictated his  
words, and that history has not verified  
them, So that this view has one merit:  
it brings us at once face to face with the  
dilemma of accepting or rejecting the book:  
and thereby, for us, who accept it as the  
word of God, becomes impossible. For us,  
who believe the prophecy is to be fulfilled,  
what was Rome then, is Rome now. Her  
fornications and abominations, as well as  
her power and pride, are matter of history and of present fact: and we look for  
her destruction to come, as we believe it is  
rapidly coming, by the means and in the  
manner here foretold).

**CH. XVIII. 1—XIX. 10**.] THE DESTRUCTION OF BABYLON. And herein,  
  
  
XVIII. 1—8.] *Announcement of the destruction*. The Seer does not see the act  
of destruction: it is prophesied to him in  
ch. xvii., and now announced, as indeed it  
had been by anticipation before, ch. xiv. 8,  
as having taken place. {1} **After these things  
I saw another angel** (another besides the  
one who shewed him the vision in the  
last chapter : or, perhaps, as it is natural to  
join epithet in some measure with the  
participle following,—another besides the