

THE MEDIATION OF CHRIST

W.W. Prescott

We are still dealing with the same general theme, that is the person of Christ. The same one concerning whom we have studied as Son of God, and Son of man, is now being studied as the mediator, as the Priest. I am constantly impressed by the fact that we can not take time enough to go over this subject thoroughly and must study only a portion of it. I want to study those principles that underly the whole study, then you can apply them in a detailed study.

I would like to have read a few Scriptures that deal with the purpose of Christ in coming to this world. These Scriptures are to set forth the purpose of Christ in his work for us.

John 10:10,28. "The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy; I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."

Note the two Scriptures given—"I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly;" "I give (present tense) unto them eternal life."

1 John 5:11-13. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God."

those who believe on the Son are those who receive the Son, note the present tense, "I give unto them eternal life." Those who have the Son by believing on Him have eternal life. Of course you recognize the difference between having eternal life in that gift and being immortal.

1 John 5:20 "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life."

I read this Scripture quite a long time before I discovered that before the pronoun "this" in that last clause is masculine. This Son of God, this Son Jesus Christ just mentioned is the true God, eternal life. That is, eternal life is a personality again, just as we have studied in all these doctrines. He who is that person is the eternal life.

1 John 1:1-3. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."

The eternal life was manifested in the person of the Son "The eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us." Now that he declares in order that those who hear him may have the same fellowship that he has, and his fellowship is with the Father and with the Son because of that life. That is the bond, the uniting bond of fellowship.

1 John 1:6,7. "If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

This fellowship with the Son must become a practical experience. First we walk in the light; second, we are cleansed,—a continuous experience you observe, "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin,—a continuous fellowship of the life, a continuous walk in the light, a continuous cleansing from sin.

John 20:30,31. "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."

What are called miracles in the other gospels are called signs in John's gospel, the same things, because they are viewed now in this gospel as signs. Now why were these signs written? In order that we might believe that the Man of Nazareth, Jesus, the Son of man, is the Christ, the Messiah, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life, that eternal life which he came to give, and which we have in him. Now it is worthy of note, I think, that the very first one of these signs, recorded in the second chapter of John, was to show his power over nature.

Instead of
in his changing the water into wine through the usual way through the process of time and the use of visible means as the soil, the vine, the rain, and sunshine, — he dispenses with all these usual means and just stood right out suddenly as the one who does it. He drew aside, as it were, the veil from nature, for what purpose? To show that he is the Son of God. What he did

call it a miracle. If we do that confuses the whole thing. That is where we had the trouble, you remember, that every operation ~~said to be~~ of nature was ~~set out as~~ a miracle. The difference between the working of God in ordinary ways and extraordinary ways makes the miracle. The miracle at Cana, where he dispensed with the ordinary methods, set Jesus forth as the one who does it in nature.

Another

The ~~second~~ sign is in the sixth chapter of John, where his disciples were in a boat on the lake, and the storm arose and they saw him coming. They were afraid, and he said, "I am; do not fear;" they received him into the boat, and immediately they were at the land -- again showing his power over nature. Now these signs are written to help us to interpret nature, and that interpretation in the light of the scripture showing that he is the one who does it, that it is his life that is working when it is interpreted in the light of scripture and seeing him we believe that he is the Son of God, and believing we have life in his name.

But you see the special point was that he was a man, right among them, and they were to believe on that man, that he was the Christ, the Son of God, because they saw that power revealed in the Man. But the believing that that eternal life was now manifested in the flesh was the way for ~~the~~ them to receive that eternal life themselves.

Now we have already seen in our study yesterday that our High Priest in the heavenly sanctuary ministers that eternal life. You remember the lesson of yesterday. Peter said "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear." The outpouring of the Holy Spirit, that ministry of himself -- because we see from the 14th chapter of John that

the advent of the Spirit is the advent of Christ, the ministry of the Spirit is the ministry of his own life. He ministers himself as priest and as mediator, but that ministry of himself is the minister of that eternal life which was manifested in his flesh, in order that it might be manifested in our flesh.

Exodus 3:14: "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

This is one of those epitomes to which I refer, the manifestation of the Son of God in creature form before he took the flesh. The name that he gave was, "I AM." You tell them that I AM sent you. Of course when you come to the sixth chapter, you have this more fully developed in the name JEHOVAH which we have seen passed into the name Jesus, JEHOVAH by salvation.

John 8:58: "Jesus said unto them, Verily verily I say unto you, before Abraham was born, I AM." There he identifies himself here in the flesh with the I AM of Ex. 3:14.

John 8:24, 28: "I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for except ye believe that I AM he; ye shall die in your sins. Jesus therefore said, when ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye love know that I AM he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things." This shows whether it is of importance to believe this truth that Jesus of Nazareth, the I AM — except ye believe that I AM, ye shall die in your sins. "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know, I AM." When you have put the Son of man, Jesus of Nazareth, on the cross, he has been taken down, laid in the tomb, and then the third day rises again, then you will know that I AM the eternal one, having life in Himself.

"If ye believe not that I AM, ye shall die in your sins." We read in 1 John that it is the fellowship with eternal life that cleanses from sin. Do you see the connection? Why? "Except ye believe that I AM, ye shall die in your sins," and that fellowship is with eternal life, revealed in his flesh, and to be revealed in our flesh as the conquering power. That is the victorious life that has conquered sin, conquered the Devil, that is the power that delivers us, cleanses us, keeps us.

Rev. 1:17, 18: "And he laid his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not; I am the first and the last, and the living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive forevermore, and I have the keys of death and of Hades."

Now in the rendering, "Behold I am alive," while it is true, yet it does not bring out the full force of it, because there are two verbs in the text. "Behold I am,"-- the same word, then the participle "living forevermore." I render it this way: "Behold I am, living forevermore." That is the I AM who has returned to heaven, the living one who has conquered death, who has demonstrated that he is the I AM, just as he said "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, ye shall know that I AM."

John 6:48: "I AM the bread of life."

John 8:12: "I AM the light of the world."

These expressions are explaining to us the I AM through these visible forms.

John 10:11: "I AM the good shepherd."

John 11:25: "I AM the resurrection and the life."

John 14:6; "I AM the way, and the truth, and the life."

John 15:1; "I AM the true vine."

Now it is very striking that in this gospel of John the I AM is thus expounded to us to bring him before us as a real being that a real manifestation of that Being, and the whole purpose is that by believing we might have life, that eternal life, that we might have fellowship with the I AM, that fellowship which cleanses from sin, that fellowship which gives us victory day by day, and remember all the time as the undercurrent, He as our mediator and priest ministers this life, and in ministering this life he ministers himself to us.

Now that does not make us God, but that is the gospel of salvation, victory over sin.

Now let us take another group of texts, and see what they teach us.

Ex. 3:14: "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

This reveals him as a self-existent one, not dependent upon any other being for existence, the self-existent one.

Isa. 45:5,6: "I am Jehovah, and there is none else; besides me there is no God." "I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me; that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me: I am Jehovah, and there is none else."

Now this was in reference to his work through Cyrus who overthrew Babylon. He says "I have created thee." He tells what he will do through him, "That they may know that there is no God beside me." I am God, and there is none else beside me.

There does need to be anybody else beside him in order for him to remain God, because he is self-existent.

Isa. 47:8: "Now therefore hear this, thou that art given to pleasures, that sittest securely, that sayest in thy heart, I am, and there is none else besides me; I shall not sit as a widow, neither shall I know the loss of children."

Of course you know from the first verse of this chapter that it is a vision that he is speaking of Babylon.

1 Cor. 15:10: "But by the grace of God, I AM WHAT I AM."

Put these texts together.

Ex. 3:14: "I AM; Is. 45, "I AM God and there is none beside me; 47:8, Babylon says, "I AM, and beside me there is none else; the Christian says, "By the grace of God I am what I am. The eternal Son manifested says, "I AM self-existent," not dependent upon anybody, the prophets say of him, I am God, and there is none beside me. But here comes Babylon and says, I am, and there is none beside me. The Christian says, By the grace of God I am what I am.

That brings out the whole principle of the true gospel and the Babylonish counterfeit. The whole principle of the true gospel where one depends upon Christ to be what he is, depends upon him for life, depends upon him for that conquering life, that grace to be revealed in his life. He is truly dependent, without me ye can do nothing, Christ said. But Babylon comes now and says, I am, takes the words right out of God's mouth, I am, and besides me there is none else. I am self-existent. I do not need anybody to look after me. I do not depend upon

anybody. There is no one else beside us. I am. The Christian says, By the grace of God I am what I am. There is the whole principle of the true gospel of salvation through the grace of God revealed in Christ, and the Babylonish counterfeit gospel of independence of God, putting one's self in the place of God.

Now let us note that in prophecy. Let us see if we find the same thing in the prophecy of Daniel. What we find in these texts.

Dan. 2:44: "And in the days of those kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people: but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms and it shall stand forever.

Now in connection with that it might be well to read Dan. 7:13, 14: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." This is the everlasting kingdom of God, established through Christ.

Dan. 3:1: Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits: he set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon. "

Observe that in the second chapter of Daniel the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream had just the head of gold. Daniel said to the king, Thou art this head of gold, that is, Babylon. Then there will be some more kingdoms after you, a kingdom of silver, then a kingdom of brass, and of iron; and after all that, the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that will stand forever. After about twenty years of experience in building up his kingdom and extending his power, Nebuchadnezzar decided that there was never to be another kingdom than Babylon, and Babylon is to stand forever. So he made an image of gold and left no place for any other kingdom. So you can see the same thing we have presented in the other scriptures. I AM, says God. My kingdom shall stand forever. Babylon says, I am, my kingdom shall stand forever.

Ps. 103:25, 26: "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment: as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed."

The same thought is brought to view in the epistle to the Hebrews, Heb. 1:11: "They shall perish; but thou remainest: and they all shall wax old as doth a garment."

The Revised Version uses the word "continuest,"—"They shall perish; but thou continuest." That kingdom shall endure forever, continue forever, because of the Person who continues as being the I am, the self-existent One.

Daniel 2:11: "And it is a rare thing that the king requireth; and there is none other that can shew it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh."

1 Tim. 3:16: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

2 Thess. 2:7: "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way."

Take these three scriptures, now. The wise men of Babylon, when they were pressed to make known that dream, said, "It is a rare thing that the king requireth; and there is none other that can shew it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh." The Babylonian religion does not take into account any God dwelling with flesh; therefore, they were unable to reveal that dream and the interpretation.

The Babylonian religion denies 1 Tim. 3:16, where it says that "God was manifest in the flesh." The mystery of godliness is that God is manifest in the flesh, and brings that eternal life, and we are dependent on Him for that life. The next mystery is the mystery of iniquity, the mystery of lawlessness, which says, "I am, and there is none else beside me," no dependence upon anybody. These are the fundamental principles setting forth the difference between the gospel of salvation through life in Christ, receiving that life through cleansing from sin, and that fallen ~~fa~~ gospel which sets aside Christ, and says "I am." One is the religion of Jesus Christ, the other is the false philosophy of Babylon. The one is acknowledgment of dependence upon God, the other is assertion of independence from God. That is Babylon.

Isaiah prophesied of the downfall of Babylon, which said, "I am, and beside me there is none else," claiming to be self-existent. 13:19 and ~~See Isa.~~ See Isa. 14:12-14: "I will make myself like the Most High." That is, he would be the invisible king of Babylon, independent of God, not receiving from Him this life, and this power for continual existence, but claiming it independent of Him. That is the Babylonian religion. The other is the religion of dependence upon Him.

In Isaiah 13:19 we have this concerning the downfall of Babylon: "And Babylon, the glory of ~~the~~ kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." Babylon had not come up to any special prominence then. Syria was prominent then, but Babylon stands out in the scripture, and not Syria. Syria never conquered Judah, but Babylon did, and from that time God's people have been under foreign powers. Mark that dif-

ference, because it is of value to us. And let me add right here: Babylon says, I am self-existent. But when you read the prophecies, you find a definite time limit set to Babylon. Do you notice that? They shall be given into his hands until a time, times, and the dividing of time. There is a limit of time to Babylon's triumph. Every one of the prophecies relating to Babylon contradicts her claim, I am. Babylon is not infinite, is not self-existent. The scriptures, speaking through the prophets, set a time limit to Babylon, while Babylon professes to be eternal, and says there is to be no kingdom following her.

The Scriptures set no time limit to one who is in fellowship with Jesus Christ. The religion of Babylon brings one to destruction, to an end. The religion of Christ introduces one to sternity, and there is no prophetic period that limits the existence of one who receives the eternal life through this, "I AM," who acknowledges dependence upon Him, does not claim self-existence, but knows that ~~maxia~~ by receiving Him he receives eternal life, which is sealed upon him at the coming of Christ, and there is no limit to his existence. That is the contrast between the gospel of Christ and the gospel of Babylon.

Now, the next series of Scriptures:

(Hebrews 1:11, 1 John 2:17, Hebrews 10:5-8, 2 Peter 3:3-7, were given out to different individuals to be read.)

Heb. 1:11: "They shall perish; but thou remainest." ~~maximax~~
~~maximaxwillkxofxGodxremainxerxcontinuuexferexerx~~

1 John 2:17: "The world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." Those two go together. He that does the will of God abideth, remaineth, continueth forever.

BPF

8-9

7-15

Hebrews 10:5-9: "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then ~~saying~~ said I, Lo, I come ~~to do thy will~~ (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second."

(PRESCOTT---Cont'd)

Now what I want you to keep along with all this is that underneath all this is the priesthood of Christ, the mediatorial work of Christ. So I kept referring to Hebrews to connect up with it.

"Thou continuest" "Son of God" "I am", "Eternal One."

In 1st John it says "He that doeth the will of God continues forever." Now in Hebrews 10:5-9 it shows how one may do the will of God. Not by sacrifice of animals, but by the coming of him who delighted to do his will, in whose heart the law is.

He taketh away the first. He takes away the mere outward things. All these outward forms are characteristic of Babylon. They were heathenish. Dependence upon ceremonies will not enable one to do the will of God; but, ("Lo, I ~~delight~~ come; I delight to do thy will, O God, yea, thy law is within my heart"--Ps. 40) When he came he did the will of God. He sacrificed himself as the true sacrifice. He goes to heaven. He ministers the power unto us that this mere outward form may be taken away, that we may be able to do the will of God. Thus we abide forever.

"Thou continuest"... Absolutely self-existent--"I am"

"He that doeth the will of God continues". But we cannot do the will of God by ourselves. His whole work as priest, giving himself as the Sacrifice, and now ministering in our behalf,-- is in order that we may be able to do the will of God--keep his commandments.

Now this is why in this closing Message of ours, the Sanctuary is, and ought to be, made to stand out so. But let us be sure to make that stand out in the right way. With Christ the minister of the New Covenant ministering himself to us.

(Presentation of old view of EASTERN QUESTION)

C. S. LONGACRE: (Reading)

STATEMENT ON DANIEL ELEVEN*C. S. Longacre*

I wish to state that I still adhere to the old view of Daniel 11 in its application as to the main features of the prophecy. I do not agree in all the details of the application that Elder Uriah Smith presents in his Book on Daniel and the Revelation. I believe that Elder Smith's positions on some points can be greatly strengthened with additional historical evidence. I shall endeavor to do this in the portion of the eleventh chapter which has been assigned to me, namely, the prophetic history of Rome. But before I take up the prophecy of the Roman empire in the eleventh chapter, I want to answer those points in the forty indictments of Brother M. C. Wilcox against the old view of Daniel 11th chapter, which relate particularly to the subject matter which I am to treat in this discussion.

In his introductory remarks he states that the old view of Daniel 11, was accepted by him because of his admiration of Elder Uriah Smith, and largely because it was held by accredited men among us, without a personal investigation of the facts. All I have to say to this indictment is that no one should accept either the old or the new position without investigating the facts for himself, so I do not see that it is any more a point in favor of the indictment of the old position than it is of the new.

The second point in the introduction states that he could not see why three of the four divisions of Greece should be recognized in the eighth chapter, and only two in the eleventh chapter, and the very one set aside in the eleventh chapter which is found necessary as a basis for Rome in the eighth chapter.

The eleventh chapter recognizes the four divisions of Alex-

ander's Empire, in verse 4, in almost the identical language as it is recorded in verse 8, Dan. 8th Chapter.

The eleventh chapter recognizes the four divisions of Alexander's Empire, in verse 4, in almost the identical language as it is recorded in verse 8, Dan. 8th Chapter.

The reason why the angel Gabriel singles out two divisions in Daniel 11th Chapter, namely the king of the north and the king of the south of Alexander's kingdom, is because these two kings were constantly overrunning Palestine and came into open conflict with God's people. God's people were being ground to pieces between the upper and nether mill-stones of these two reigning monarchies, and it was God's purpose to deal only with the nations which vitally affected the future welfare and destiny of his people and his cause. The fact that the Macedonian king through which Rome gained her ascendancy is not mentioned in this connection, does not imply that that kingdom was not in existence during this period. That power simply did not come in contact with God's people during this time, and consequently is not mentioned. Nevertheless, history testifies to the fact that Lysimachus conquered the territory of Cassander, and Seleucus conquered Lysimachus and for some time was absolute master of the three divisions of the Grecian Empire. He was the mighty king of the north. Afterwards the Macedonian horn revolted and gained its independence, but its rulers never came in contact with God's people, and for this reason this power is not referred to again until the Romans conquered Macedonia and exalted themselves to establish the vision."

The third point in the introduction that Elder James White made the statement that the eleventh chapter of Daniel must parallel the four universal kingdoms of Dan. 2, 7 and 8th in the great political

outlines clear down to the second coming of Christ is not a logical conclusion. The same angel that revealed the political and ecclesiastical history of the world to Daniel also revealed the political and ecclesiastical history of the world during the Christian dispensation to John, the Revelator. The political history of the fourth kingdom was revealed to John, in the seven trumpets. The first four trumpets deal with the history of the Roman Empire, down to the time it was divided into ten divisions and the papacy was established. Then three woes or judgment trumpets are presented which introduce the Mohammedan power in the 9th chapter and the French nation in the eleventh chapter of Revelation under the first and second woes. The Mohammedan and French nationalities are mentioned as the last actors upon the stage in the political history of the seven trumpets. The next scene is the third woe—the awful time of trouble among the nations, and the second coming of Christ. It is an exact parallel of the latter part of the eleventh chapter and the first part of the 12th chapter of Daniel. Since the same angel in the Book of Revelation, closes the political history of the fourth universal empire with a description of the atheistical French nation which largely established the supremacy of the Papacy and finally disestablished it, by making war against God and all religious things, and since the same angel also mentions the Mohammedan power as waning and drying up just before Christ comes, that the nations of the whole world may be gathered together to the great battle of Armageddon within the domain of the Turk, and since all this is presented by the same angel that spoke to Daniel, as the great climax of the folly and destiny of the political history of nations in the Book of Revelation, why should it be considered as an incredible thing for the same angel to follow the

same outline of political history in the latter portion of the prophecy in the eleventh chapter of Daniel.

Moreover, we are plainly informed by the angel in the Book of Revelation that the first and second woes—namely the Mohammedan and French infidel nationalities were employed by the Lord as a scourge or judgment to punish the Papacy for their iniquities, their "worship of devils, and idols of gold, and silver and brass, and stone and of wood," and for "their murders," "their sorceries," "their fornication," and "their thefts."

But the Papacy did not repent of these things after the Lord afflicted them with the Turks, so the Lord accomplished his indignation upon the Papacy which He had before determined should be done by inflicting upon it a deadly wound, and He used infidel France to inflict the wound and accomplish his purpose. For the same reason France is introduced in Daniel eleven as in Revelation eleven to bring to view the atheistic king that was to prosper until God's indignation was accomplished against the papacy and the deadly wound inflicted, and also as the king of the bottomless pit that was to make war against God's two witnesses at the time the 1260 years expired and was to slay them in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where they also crucified our Lord.

The Book of Revelation in its political outlines of the Christian dispensation is a complement of the eleventh chapter of Daniel. It is the same angel that gives both outlines with additional light in the book of Revelation.

Another objection raised is that the old view of Daniel eleven is not the denominational view. This raises the question, who and what is the denomination? It is true we have no written creed outside of the Bible. But is it not equally true that all our denominational books and

periodicals are supposed to advocate our denominational views upon the doctrines and prophecies of the Bible? Have not all our periodicals and published books and pamphlets authorized by the denomination, set forth the old view of Dan. 11 until this day? If they do not represent the denominational view, then I fail to see why one or two articles written by one or two men in our periodicals or pamphlets unauthorized in the publication of the new view of Daniel 11 represents the denominational view.

Objection 1. in the real indictment states that the old view admits that Dan. 10-12 is a fuller explanation of the vision of Daniel 8 and 9, and then utterly departs from the idea, and drags in two powers, the principal one of which is a waning power.

I have already answered this indictment by showing that the old view winds up the political history of Rome in the eleventh chapter of Daniel exactly as John the Revelator winds up the history of Rome in the seven trumpets. The old view recognizes the political outlines of the 8th chapter in the eleventh, with the additional light that the book of Revelation throws upon the latter part of the prophecy, but the new view not only ignores the light that the Book of Revelation throws upon this prophecy by giving the history of the atheistical French and Mohammedan forces which God used to punish and disestablish the Papacy at the termination of the 1260 years of papal persecutions, but the new view also utterly ignores the establishment in the prophecy of the fourth universal empire, the whole history of imperial Rome, its destruction of the mighty and holy people, its standing up against the Prince of princes, and its consequent desolations of Jerusalem and Palestine. It makes one tremendous leap from Antiochus Epiphanes B.C. 164 to the establishment of the Papacy in the 6th century this side of

Christ—a period of over seven hundred years during which the most momentous events occurred in the history of the whole world relative to God's people and cause. If Antiochus Epiphanes should not be omitted in the eleventh chapter of Daniel because he slew 40,000 Jews on his return from Egypt, and changed the priest-hood and offered swine's blood in the temple, what shall we say of the new view which not only omits the founders of imperial Rome and the entire history of imperial Rome, but also all allusion to the power that put to death the Prince of the covenant, that in a single siege of Jerusalem slew not 40,000 thousand but ~~not~~ eleven hundred thousand, scattered the residue into all parts of the world, laid waste their city and temple, and forever abolished the high priest-hood among the Jews? Upon which profanation and persecution would the angel be likely to lay the greater emphasis, upon that carried on by Antiochus Epiphanes or by imperial Rome?

Point 2. of the indictment, states that the old view eliminates Rome as the climax of all antagonistic powers, and draws into the prophecy a power not growing vigorous and dominating, but long past its prime, a decrepit, waning, conquered power at best, and leaves Rome out of the prophecy with no further mention, a proceeding for which there is no justification.

My answer to this objection is that the political history of the seven trumpets in the Book of Revelation proceeds along the same line as the old view, and therefore this indictment is as much against John the Revelator as it is against those who hold the old view of Dan. 11. Only John leaves Rome out of the prophecy a great deal earlier in the Christian dispensation and introduces the Mohammedan and French Nationalities than the old view does on Dan. 11. The Book of Revelation is a justification of the old view and not of the new.

Objection 3. states that all the prophetic lines of Daniel deal

with dominating world dynasties, even the eleventh admittedly to verse 35, inclusive, and then the old view sets them all aside, and introduces two new nations, neither of which are world powers. My answer to this objection is that not one of Daniel's prophecies deals with "dominating world dynasties" after Rome was divided into ten kingdoms. There were to be no more "world dynasties" after 476 A. D. until the everlasting kingdom of Christ is set up. After 476 A. D. the prophecies throughout the Books of Daniel and Revelation deal with the nations which divided the Roman Empire, and not with world dynasties. The prophecies indicate that some of these nations would be weak and waning powers.

Objection 4, states that the old view fails utterly to grasp the design of Chapter 11, the revelation of evil powers to stand up for world dominion against Him who only has the right to reign. My answer to this objection is that no such design of world dominance on the part of the king of the north is implied or mentioned in the latter part of the eleventh chapter of Daniel.

The prophecy clearly indicates that other nations have supported the king of the north but finally all help was refused and he as a consequence, came to his end, which precipitated the Battle of Armageddon, into which all nations were drawn. The king of the north comes to his end before this last great battle among the nations of the whole world is fought. This proves clearly that the king of the north is not the papacy, because the papacy in its spiritual dominance over the nations of the earth does not come to its end until it is consumed by the brightness of Christ's coming, after the Battle of Armageddon has been fought or while the conflict is still raging.

Objection 5, states that the old view telescopes a period of time unnatural to every line of prophecy, in order to accommodate

itself to a misunderstood phrase "a raiser of taxes."

806

My answer to this objection is that the recorded prophecy of Christ in Matthew 24, is written on the telescopic plan. From the verses 3 to 14 he carries us clear down to the end, and then backs up again and begins with the destruction of Jerusalem in verse 15. The same plan is followed in Revelation 20, 21 and 22. Revelation 20th chapter tells of the complete destruction of the wicked in the lake of fire. The first part of the 21st chapter tells of the passing away of the former earth and the restoration of the new earth, and then the eighth verse of the 21st and the 15th verse of the 22nd chapter backs up again and tell us of things that are to take place on the former earth. The telescoping, backing up, and jumping plan in outlining the prophetic periods is not unnatural in any line of prophecy. The new view leaps across a gap of 700 years and overlooks the most important events the Bible predicted would occur during that period of time.

Objection 2, states that the old view places the time of the end in 1798 contrary to the clear logic of Dan. 2:14-19, and 12:4,10,11, which places it at the end of the 2300 days, as does also the Spirit of Prophecy.

My answer to this objection is that the prophet Daniel and the Spirit of Prophecy both place the beginning of the time of the end at 1798 the termination of the 1260 days instead of the 2300 days. Dan. 8:17, and Dan. 12:4,10 tell us clearly that the vision shall be sealed and not understood till the time of the end, then it was to be unsealed and understood. But this did not mean that the vision of the 2300 days was not to be understood until the 2300 days expired in 1844, but that the vision was to be unsealed and understood at the time of the end before the time period of the 2300 days were ended. Unfortunately the indictment omitted Dan. 12:7,9 and a quotation from the Spirit of Prophecy on page

355 of the Great Controversy. In Dan. 12:4-9 we read that the angel asked the man clothed in linen: "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" and the man clothed in linen answered: "That it shall be for a time, times and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. . . . So thy say Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end."

Till the time of the end of what? Our would most naturally conclude the time of the end of the 1260 days just alluded to. And to this agree the words of the Spirit of Prophecy on page 356 of the Great Controversy which read as follows: "That part of his prophecy which related to the last days, Daniel was bidden to close up and seal to the time of the end." Not till we reach this time could a message concerning the judgment be proclaimed, based on a fulfillment of these prophecies. But at the time of the end, says the prophet, "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased". . . . Since 1798 the book of Daniel has been unsealed, knowledge of the prophecies has increased, and many have proclaimed the solemn message of the judgment near. This makes it very clear that both the prophecy of Daniel and the Spirit of Prophecy place the commencement of the time of the end at the termination of the 1260 day prophecy, and not at the end of the 2300 days. The 2300 days end in the time of the end but not at the ~~the~~ beginning of time of the end.

Objection 7 states that the old view makes territory a means of identification in succession of empire, rather than world dominion and character, contrary to our interpretation uniformly followed in all other symbolic prophecy. My answer to this objection is that it is impossible to determine and locate the king of the north and the king of the south and the kings of the East and the kings of the West

on any other basis than a territorial basis. When there is only one world king that rules at a given time it is easy to locate him on the basis of world dominion and character, but when you have two or more kings reigning in the world contemporaneously it is impossible to identify them on a basis of world dominion and character. To which one shall we give the prerogative of world dominion and character when each has only a part of the world. The old view follows the same rule of interpretation concerning the king of the North and the king of the South throughout the entire chapter, whereas the new view follows two rules of interpretation concerning these two kings—one a literal territorial view at the beginning of the chapter and a second mystical philosophical interpretation at the end of the chapter.

Objection 8 states that the old view presents an interpretation with a constantly diminishing Biblical evidence instead of cumulative proof as do other prophecies. My answer to this objection is that the old view has all the Biblical evidence that the new view holds on the Papacy and in addition the old view has the cumulative Biblical evidence found in the 9th, 11th, and 16th chapters of the Book of Revelation on the French and Turks. The old view has more Bible evidence in the eleventh chapter than has the new view.

Objection 10, states that the old view makes the waning power of Turkey a striking sign of the last days, and that there is not the slightest evidence of its nearer fulfillment now than a half century ago.

My answer to this objection is that the history of the dismemberment of the Turkish empire during the past 50 years is a sufficient refutation of this indictment of the old view.

Objection 14 states that the old view makes Thrace or Turkey

in Europe a necessary part of the identification of the king of the North, and yet no Seleucid king held any part of Turkey in Europe, unless we may count the brief time after Seleucus Nicator conquered Lysimachus.

My answer to this objection is that Lysimachus the first and original king of the north mentioned in the eleventh chapter after Alexander's kingdom was divided, which held all of Thrace which included the countries on the Hellespont and the Bosphorus and Asia Minor, Armenia and Media, north of Syria. Later Lysimachus added to his northern territory all the dominion of Cassander's two sons—namely Macedonia and the adjacent countries. Then Seleucus after he had invaded India returned and added all of Asia Minor to his own vast dominion, and later at the battle of Corupedion in B. C. 281 defeated and slew Lysimachus, and the historian says, "in consequence of which Seleucus made himself master of all his dominions" and also "became master of all the treasures of Lysimachus." Antiochus Euter, the son of Seleucus succeeded his father and reigned for nineteen years over all his father's dominions. Thus the dynasty of the Seleucides was firmly established in the territory of the king of the North in Europe as well as in Asia.

Objection 15, states that the old view declares that Lysimachus conquered Cassander, when these two men never went to war against each other.

My answer to this objection is that this indictment rests on a point of mere technicality. Elder Smith used the figure of Personification instead of metonymy. What he really meant was not Cassander but Cassander kingdom in the days of his two sons—the lawful successors.

Objection 16, states that the old view declares that Seleucus conquered Lysimachus and thus became possessed of Macedonia and Thrace,

-12-

when nothing of the kind occurred.

I have already answered this indictment under objection 14, by giving historical proof that Seleucus became the sole master of all the dominions and all the treasures of Lysimachus, and Seleucus' son Antiochus Soter, succeeded to all his father's conquered possessions. A later disintegration of the western possessions in Europe does not militate against what constituted the original territory of the king of the North. When Rome conquered the territory of the original king of the North, it for a time being was the king of the North on the same basis as the Seleucidae of the East became the kings of the North. For the same reason, and on exactly the same basis, when the Ottoman rulers wrested this territory out of the hands of the Romans and drove them back into Western Europe, did the Turkish rulers become the kings of North. There is logic and consistency in this position of the old view.

Objection 17 states that the old view affirms that there were only two powers left of Alexander's empire when Seleucus won the victory in B. C. 331, whereas history shows there were three powers which persisted till Rome became dominant.

My answer to this indictment is that it does not correctly represent the old view. The old view insists that there were only two powers existent for a limited time, after which the Macedonian dynasty again gained its independence. But this fact does not change the territorial status of the original king of the North. The old view maintains the same division in Dan. 11 as it does in Dan. 8.

Objection 18, states that the old view in its shunting back

in the history of Rome to anchor to some expressions loses the prophacy of the greatest persecution the Jewish people ever suffered, under Antiochus IV.

My answer to this indictment is that it impeaches its own testimony. In order to bring in the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes which were but as a drop in the bucket in comparison to what imperial Rome did to the Jews, the new view devotes 16 verses of Daniel 11, to the short reign of eleven years of Antiochus Epiphanes and not a single verse to imperial Rome, and then without even mentioning that a fourth kingdom that was to rule all the world has been established on earth without mentioning the fact that imperial Rome destroyed millions upon millions of Jews in entirely subjugating their nation and many cities without mentioning the ~~xxx~~ worst siege, famine and destruction that Jerusalem ever experienced at the hands of the Romans, without alluding to the power that was to crucify the Prince of the Covenant, and was to destroy the Sanctuary and the high-priest-hood, the new view leaps across a gap of 702 years from Antiochus Epiphanes to the establishment of the Papacy. The new view has set at naught its own arguments when it eliminates all the fearful and unparalleled devastations and persecutions of imperial Rome upon the Jews for a period of nearly 700 years and substitutes in its place the short period of a little more than three years during which Antiochus Epiphanes waged war upon the Jews, and employs sixteen verses of the prophecy to cover this short period.

It may be well to state right here why Antiochus Epiphanes is allowed to cover so many verses in the eleventh chapter of Daniel. The religious commentators of the Jewish Church were the first to give this much attention to Antiochus Epiphanes in order to avoid an allusion to the Messiah as the Prince of the Covenant being put to death

Later the commentators of the Catholic Church adapted the same views on this prophecy and had Antiochus Epiphanes cover nearly the whole of the prophecy from the fifteenth verse on down, so as to avoid the application of the prophecy to the Papacy from verses 31 to 38 inclusive. A number of modern Protestant writers have adopted the interpretation of the Catholic Church down to verse 31, then finding themselves in a dilemma to span a gap of 702 years they shut their eyes to the most momentous events in connection with the history of God's people and the unfolding of God's plan in the world, and blindly leap across a gap of seven centuries and land squarely upon the establishment of the supremacy of the Papacy.

Elder Uriah Smith was conversant with all these facts just stated and alludes to them in his treatise of the little horn that waxed exceeding great where these same Bible commentators and church historians endeavored to prove that the little horn represented Antiochus Epiphanes.

Elder Smith says: "The Romanists take that view to avoid the application of the prophecy to themselves; and many Protestants follow them, in order to oppose the doctrine that the second advent of Christ is now at hand." That Elder Smith was very familiar with the writers who hold this new view on Daniel 11, is quite apparent. He quotes from the works that are brought forward to sustain the new view, namely, Maccabees; Josephus's Antiquities; Prideaux; Bishop of Newton and others. He saw the error of their arguments and refused to follow them.

Objection 32, states again that the old view departs from the world-dominance principle, invariably used in other prophecies, and makes exact territory the chief factor of identification. I have already answered this objection, by showing that there are many nations and not one universal nation ruling the world in the latter portions of the great prophecies of Daniel and Revelation.

Objection 35 states that the old view presents the opinions of men, man, man, ranged around 1788, and the clause, "He shall come to his end and none shall help him." The old view presents a mighty mass of interesting history, artful diplomacy, and theories of men, but what do the wise men of the world know about the fulfillment of prophecy anyway. We believe these things because God says so.

My answer to this objection is that the author of this indictment, I find, by looking his treatise through, made some twenty-six appeals to the writings of men to support his views. The new view presents the explanation of twenty-six verses of Daniel eleventh chapter without a single reference to the Bible, and quotes copiously from Bishop Newton, Prideaux, and other human authorities, whereas the old view interprets the latter part of the eleventh chapter of Daniel in harmony with the inspired record of the political history of the Book of Revelation, as it is outlined in the eighth, ninth, eleventh and sixteenth chapters of Revelation. The old view presents both Bible and history -- the only logical way to proceed in giving an explanation of the prophecies.

Objection 36, is a repetition of indictment 35, which I have just answered.

Objections 38 and 39 find fault with the old view because it confines the territory of the king of the North to a little strip of territory north of Palestine, instead of giving the appellation -- the King of the North -- a world dominant character, that is to say a mystical, philosophical, Theosophistic, Neo-Platonic interpretation. The great historian Heander says that this latter method of interpreting the Scriptures, doctrines and prophecies of the Bible

eludes all possibility of comprehension, changes the literal into a spiritual sense by arbitrary interpretations, and clothes all things in a hidden meaning so as to make things incomprehensible, ineffable, and the Absolute Being identical with nothing. The new view adheres to a literal interpretation of the king of the North and the king of the South, from the beginning of the division of Alexander's kingdom until we come to the 31st verse of Daniel II, then when we read the 40th verse it suddenly changes its rule of interpretation and adopts the mystical, Theosophistic, Neo-Platonic system of interpretation. The old view is consistent and sticks to the literal text and literal interpretation throughout the entire chapter, and has literal kings that are reigning in literal territory.

ROMAN EMPIRE

I shall devote the rest of my time to the presentation of historical evidence that Rome is introduced into the prophecy in the 14th verses of the eleventh chapter, and fits the appellation, "the robbers of thy people" who were to "exalt themselves to establish the vision," a great deal better than a motley band of robbers and outlaws among the Jews in Palestine, as is held by the new view.

I accept the objective genitive instead of the subjective genitive as being the proper construction of the Hebrew text. There are many excellent authorities that sustain this construction of the text, and render it "the robbers of thy people," "the breakers of thy people," "the destroyers of thy people," etc.

How remarkably this designation fits the little horn that was to wax exceeding great in the vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel, "he shall destroy wonderfully and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people, and he shall also

stand up against the Prince of princes, but he (Rome) shall be broken without hands."

"The robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision, but they shall fall," that is, "they shall be broken without hands" without human instrumentality. The original name of the Romans was robbers. Mommsen, Volume I, Book I, Chapter 4, Paragraph 1.

"This much is certain," says Mommsen, "that in the oldest form of it [the name of the Romans] known to us the inhabitants of the castron [on the hills of the Tiber] are called not Romans, but (by a shifting sound that frequently occurs in the earlier period of a language, but fall very early into abeyance in Latin) Ramnians (Ramnes) a fact which constitutes an expressive testimony to the immortal antiquity of the name." "Ramnes" means "foresters, or bushmen" and "bushmen" was the ancient term for "robbers." Hence Ramnes or Ramnian, contracted later to Romane, means literally "robbers" or "violent men," "the children of the violent." Later they also called themselves "Romani collini" or "Romans of the Hill," others called them, "Hill-men" and "Mount Romans."

They were a lot of robbers and outlaws, and consequently their appellation - Ramnians, later contracted to Romans.

In Arnold's History of Rome, Chapter I, paragraph 9, we read: "Romulus set apart a place of refuge to which any man might flee and be safe from his pursuers. So many fled thither from the country round about; those who had shed blood and fled from the avenger of blood. . . and even men of low degree who had run away from their lords." "So the city was filled with people (men) and they wanted wives, and the nations round about would not give them any wives."

"Thus they resorted to a curious expedient. A great festival in honor of Neptune was appointed, and the neighboring families were

invited to come with their families. In the midst of the games the young Romans rushed among the spectators, and each seizing a maiden, carried her off to be his wife.* Thus they stole their wives, and the surrounding nations, the Greeks and the Sabines, from whom they stole their wives, called them robbers.*

In Rollins' Ancient History, Books 22 and 23, Sec. 3, Paragraph 31, we find a letter written by Mithridates, king of Armenia to Arsaces, king of the Parthians as follows:

"Do you know that the Romans when they found themselves stopped by the ocean in the west turned their arms this way, that to look back to their foundation, and origin, whatever they had they had from violence; homes, wives, and dominion. A vile herd of every kind of vagabonds, without country, without forefathers, they established themselves for the misfortune of the human race. Neither divine or human laws restrained them from destroying remote neighbors, the weak or the powerful, their allies, or friends. They reckon as enemies all that are not their slaves and especially whatever bears the name of king. . . . It will be for your immortal glory to have supported two great kings and to have conquered and destroyed these robbers of the world."

The Hebrew word for "robbers" in Daniel 11:14, is a very significant word and is only used by the Lord himself, once in Daniel, once in Jeremiah, and again in Ezekiel, once in Isaiah and once in the Psalms. The Hebrew is "parits." Isaiah applies it to a "ravenous beast." Ezekiel in predicting the future destruction of Jerusalem after the fashion of Moses' prediction in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, concludes by saying: "I will give it (sanctuary) into the hands of the strangers for a prey, and to the wicked of the earth for a spoil; and they shall pollute it. My face will I also turn from them,

and they shall pollute my secret place: for the robbers (parits) shall enter into it and defile it." This cannot refer to Nebuchadnezzar, for he had already polluted the sanctuary and taken its vessels as a prey and spoil. It must refer to the future pollution of the sanctuary by the Romans in A.D. 70.

In Psalm 17:4 the Hebrew word "parits" is translated "the destroyer." Gesenius in his Hebrew lexicon defines the word "parits" "one violent, rapacious, an oppressor, a tyrant." How fittingly the appellations: "the destroyer of thy people," "the oppressors of thy people," "the tyrants of thy people" who shall exalt themselves to establish the vision," "in those times" apply to the Romans. How aptly the expression: "The destroyers of thy people who shall exalt themselves to establish the vision" fits into the language of the vision of Daniel 8:24 and 25. Here Imperial Rome is represented in the following descriptive language: "And he shall magnify (exalt) himself." "And he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people," "he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes." It was Imperial Rome that was to stand up against the Prince of princes. It was Imperial Rome that was to establish the vision of the seventy weeks in Daniel ninth chapter that was determined upon his people and his holy city. It was Imperial Rome that was to make possible the fulfillment of this vision, which was to seal up both the vision and the prophecy and make them sure, when they "cut off," (or literally "put to death as a malefactor") "the Messiah."

It is this same vision that the angel again refers to in Dan. 11:14. It is the same Prince of princes that the angel refers to in Dan. 11:23. "The Prince of the covenant," does not mean "a prince of a covenant." The angel is specific in his language, just as God is when He says "the seventh day is the Sabbath" not a seventh day or any seventh day. "The Prince of

of the Covenant." It is a specific Prince and a specific Covenant. Of what covenant is Christ the Prince? For what covenant was He broken? The word "broken" here is "shabar" and means "to meet a violent end or death" when applied to man." The prince of the covenant was to meet a violent death. Paul states that the old covenant was ratified with the blood of animals which met a violent death, therefore it was necessary that the new covenant be ratified by the death of the Prince of life in the same way.

It is the same mighty imperial Rome that caused "craft" (or deceit)*to prosper in his hand * in Daniel 8:25 that was to "work deceitfully" after the league was perfected between the Jews and Romans in 161 B.C. While the Romans promised to protect the Jews and preserve their land and nation inviolate from all their enemies, the Caesars who did according to their own will before whom none were able to stand, finally entered into the glorious land, and by their hands it was consumed.

After the great Caesar conquered the holy land in 65 B.C. he set his face to enter by force upon the possession of the whole kingdom. Egypt was the only division of "the whole kingdom" of Alexander that was not yet brought into subjection to the Roman power, and Caesar, the founder of imperial Rome, the one man that made the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2, 7, and 8, as world empire, now sets his face to enter by force into Egypt, where Cleopatra practiced her wily and corrupting machinations upon Caesar and his generals, and finally turned against him, but he finally subdued all his enemies and turned his face as a world monarch toward the stronghold of his own land -- the capital of the Roman Empire.

Froude in his wonderful book on "Caesar - A Sketch," using this significant language as to the divine purpose and mission

of Caesar in connection with God's plan and work in this earth, says:

"Caesar . . . came into the world at a special time and for a special object. The old religions were dead, from the pillars of Hercules to the Euphrates and the Nile, and the principles on which human society had been constructed were dead also. . . . A new life was about to dawn for mankind. Poetry, and faith, and devotion were to spring again out of the seeds which were sleeping in the heart of humanity. But this life which is to endure grows slowly; and as the soil must be prepared before the wheat can be sown, so before the Kingdom of Heaven could throw up its shoots there was needed a kingdom of this world where the nations were neither torn to pieces by violence nor were rushing after false ideals and spurious ambitions. Such a kingdom was the Empire of the Caesars — a kingdom where peaceful men could work, think, and speak as they pleased, and travel freely among provinces ruled for the most part by Gallies, who protected life and property, and forbade fanatics to tear each other in pieces for their religious opinions. "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death," was the complaint of the Jewish priests to the Roman governor. Had Europe and Asia been covered with independent nations, each with a local religion represented in its ruling powers, Christianity must have been stifled in its cradle. If St. Paul had escaped the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, he would have been torn to pieces by the silver-smith at Ephesus. The appeal to Caesar's judgment-seat was the shield of his mission, and alone made possible his success.

"And this spirit, which confined government to its simplest duties, while it left opinion unfettered, was especially present in Julius Caesar himself. . . . He fought his battles to establish some tolerable degree of justice in the government of this world; and he succeeded, though he was murdered for doing it.

"Strange and startling resemblance between the fate of the founder of the kingdom of this world and of the founder of the kingdom not of this world, for which the first was the preparation." --

Froude - "Caesar - A Sketch," pages 434 - 436.

It seems strange that divine revelation in the Book of Daniel should deal with the founder of the Babylonian kingdom, the conqueror of the Babylonian Empire, the founder of the Grecian Empire and entirely omit any mention of the founder of the greatest world empire -- which was finally "to destroy the mighty and the holy people" and "also stand up against the Prince of princes, yea, the Prince of the covenant," and, which mighty empire was to "pollute the sanctuary of strength, and take away the daily sacrifice" and in its place establish the abomination that maketh desolate for a thousand two hundred and ninety years. The fact that the new view of Daniel 11 eliminates entirely all the dealings of imperial Rome with God's people and God's cause, and skips from Antiochus Epiphanes to the establishment of the Papacy, a period of over 700 years, is a sufficient defect in itself to destroy the force of the whole argument in support of Antiochus Epiphanes covering all the prophetic history from verse 15 to 31 of Daniel 11. Antiochus Epiphanes may have been important but can he eclipse the whole history of imperial Rome and what imperial Rome did to God's people? Was he greater than the founder of imperial Rome -- the conqueror of the world?

"But," says the angel to Daniel, "he shall stumble and fall, and not be found."

Froude in commenting on Caesar's death says: "As Caesar had lived to reconstruct the Roman world, so his death was necessary to finish the work. . . . Caesar entered and took his seat on Caesar's golden chair on the rostrum of the Roman Senate. A group of conspirators gathered around him, presenting a petition which he refused to grant. Caesar rose

from his seat. Cassius stabbed him in the throat. He looked round, and seeing not one friendly face, but only a ring of daggers pointing at him, he drew his gown over his head, gathered the folds about him that he might fall decently, and sank down without uttering another word." "He stumbled and fell," pierced with twenty-three daggers. "Thus the great Caesar died." The angel said: "He shall turn his face toward the stronghold of his own land, but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found."

Why was he not found after he stumbled and fell? Let Froude give the answer. "They [the Roman senators] took on themselves the order of the funeral. They surrounded the body, which was reverently raised by the officers of the Forum. Part proposed to carry it to the Temple of Jupiter, in the Capitol, and burn it under the eyes of the assassins; part to take it into the Senate-house and use the meeting place of the Optimates a second time as a pyre of the people's friend. A few legionaries. . . advised that it should be consumed where it lay. The platform was torn up and the broken timbers piled into a heap. Chairs and benches were thrown on to it, the whole crowd rushing wildly to add a chip or splinter. Actors flung in their dresses, musicians their instrumentum, soldiers their swords. Women added their necklaces and scarfs. Mothers brought up their children to contribute toys and playthings. On the pile so composed the body of Caesar was reduced to ashes. . . . The demonstrations of sorrow were most remarkable among the Jews, crowds of whom continued for many nights to collect and wail in the Forum at the scene of the singular ceremony." Ibid -- pages 414, 415.

They sought for the great Caesar, their friend, but he was not to be found. He stumbled and fell, was reduced to ashes, they still sought after him, but he was not found. How remarkably he fulfilled this prophecy.

"Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom."

The great Augustus Caesar succeeded Julius Caesar. He is preeminently styled both in history and in sacred writ as the greatest tax raiser the world ever saw. Luke referring to the great Augustus, who reigned at the time of Christ's birth, in the time of "the glory of the kingdom," says: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." A ruler who taxed all the world is certainly a greater "raiser of taxes" than was Seleucus Philopater who only laid a small tax upon the Jews so he might be able to pay his annual tribute of 40,000 talents to the Romans, who had laid claim to his dominions.

"In the glory of the kingdom." What kingdom? If it is Israel's kingdom, all is well. For Christ is the glory of Israel's kingdom, and he appeared during the reign of the "raiser of taxes" Augustus Caesar. If it refers to the time of the glory of the kingdom of imperial Rome -- all is well. Because the reign of Augustus Caesar is called, in history, "The Augustan Age," "the Golden Age." He truly appeared "in the glory of the kingdom" of imperial Rome.

And said the angel to Daniel: "And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom."

The new view holds that this verse refers to Antiochus Epiphanes -- the Illustrious. No doubt, Antiochus Epiphanes was vile, but if we are to believe the records of Suetonius, a Roman Senator, who gives us a biography of the life of Tiberius Caesar, we must admit that Antiochus Epiphanes was indeed illustrious in virtues in comparison to the vile, voluptuous, profligate and drunken life which Tiberius Caesar lived. Seneca says, Tiberius was only drunk once in his life, and that was all the time.

Of all the Caesars, that Suetonius describes Tiberius is

the vilest. Tiberius after he had fully established himself upon the throne of Rome through flatteries, so abundantly attested to by historians, erected a temporary residence in a villa on an island near the ancient city of Pompeii, and if I should read to you all the vile things that Suetonius says Tiberius indulged in, with the profligates of Pompeii, you can readily understand why the Lord rained brimstone and fiery lava out of the mouth of Mt. Vesuvius upon the inhabitants of this wicked city and destroyed them all in A.D. 79. I have never read anything so revolting, sickening, and disgusting of any ruler as the villanous character of Tiberius. No other ruler is more deserving of the title "a vile person" as the successor of Augustus Caesar, who came "in peaceably and obtained the kingdom by flatteries." It is no wonder when Livia, the wife of Augustus, by flatteries besought the great Emperor to nominate Tiberius as his successor that he said: "Your son is too vile to wear the purple of Rome."

It was during Tiberius' reign that "the Prince of the Covenant" met a violent death as is clearly set forth in the prophecy concerning this vile king. After mention is made of the violent death which the prince of the new covenant was to suffer, we are introduced to a league or alliance which was made with Rome after which Rome was to "work deceitfully" "against the holy covenant." Just as soon as the Prince of the new Covenant is introduced in the 22nd verse -- the new or holy covenant, the sanctuary of strength, and the daily ministry of the prince of the covenant become the bone of contention with Rome, until finally the abomination of desolation is set up in place of the continual ministry of the Prince of the covenant. Five times the holy covenant is mentioned after the Prince of the new covenant has ratified it by his death, until the Papacy obscures his daily ministry of the new covenant blessings by setting up its own abominable system. The warfare of Rome both pagan and papal is against the new covenant, the Prince of the new covenant, and his sanctuary. A lack of time prevents me from going into a detailed explanation of the history of imperial Rome from verses 23 to 31.

a

11a

7/15

LACEY: [At this point Brother Lacey continued his study of Revelation 17. After a brief review of what had been presented the previous day, which included the tenth verse, he proceeded as follows:]

"And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition."

Assuming that this beast is Satan, because of his identity with Revelation 12, and the fact that he ascends out of the bottomless pit, and goes into perdition -- Then we have to interpret these enigmatical expressions, The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall come. The meaning isn't right on the surface, and as I apply it to Satan in the light of these incidents, that statement in the Great Controversy that Satan is going to impersonate Christ -- that is the thing that impressed me as a youth. The final act in the great drama. I will admit that that is throwing a different light on our interpretation of it, and I think I can see a meaning in these expressions if we regard it in that light. Isn't the dragon Satan, that old serpent? Who was the serpent? The serpent was the highest intelligence of all at that time, and Satan took that form and appears to Eve. And I think of that expression, The beast that was, and is not," means that he was personally manifested, though not in human form. In an analogous way, at the end Satan is going to come as Christ, taking the form of the highest intelligence known now. Now if Satan were to try to deceive the world, it would be useless to come as Mohammed, or as the head of the Buddhists, or as Confucius, but if he came as Jesus Christ, the Mohammedans honor Christ,

the Buddhists honor Christ, and let him come as Christ, and then he may take the whole world, and so the beast that was means that he was personally manifested as the serpent. Now he stands behind the scenes entirely. Then he is coming by and by as Christ, and then he shall appear. The Greek word translated "yet is" is the same word that is used in reference to the coming of Christ. He shall be present as Christ, the beast that was and is not, and shall come, and all the world shall wonder when they behold that beast.

So that expression I explain that way, admitting the enigma.

(H.C.LACEY, continued) (Reading Rev. 17:9, 10) "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space." This refers to the papacy. There is nothing said about the continuance of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, or Rome; but of Rome Papal it is said that he must continue a time, times, and half a time, forty-two months, a short time. In the 13th chapter it is stated that Satan persecuted the woman, because he knows that he ^{compass} "hath but a short time." ~~xxxxxxx~~ In the ~~xxxxxxx~~ of that "short time" we must put 3,000 years, or from the cross to the time when Satan is destroyed.

Now comes the application of the 11th verse: "And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." That brings us face to face with that final act in the great drama. Who is this beast? The beast is Satan himself,--"the beast that was [in the Garden of Eden] "and is not" [in John's day he was not manifested] "even he is the eighth." Satan has used the world governments or powers as heads to work through; but this verse says that the beast himself is the eighth. Isn't that sufficient for us to say that that represents Satan's impersonation of Christ? He becomes the eighth world power. After 2,000 years of Christian teaching, what power could come up that could take charge of the world and reign if it is not someone who pretends to be Christ? Satan is the beast. If he came as Satan, he would not be the eighth head; nor if he came as Mohammed or Confucius, or any of those great leaders; but if he came as Jesus Christ, why even the Jews are beginning to recognize Him as one of

the great prophets. I think I can see how, if a being of majestic brightness were to come and perform miracles of healing the sick, ~~raising the dead~~ and speak gracious words such as Christ would speak, in a little while the world might be ~~induced~~ induced to give him allegiance.

Now do you see what is meant by verse 11, where it says, "even he is the eighth, and is of the seven"? It does not say he is one of the seven, but he "is of the seven." That is, he is behind Egypt, he is behind Rome, he is behind Babylon. Isn't that true?

He is "of the seven, and goeth into perdition." Reading that in the light of Revelation 20, Satan comes out of the bottomless pit and goes into perdition.

Now note the simplicity of this study. We just take the simple statements of the Bible and put them alongside of "Great Controversy." difficulty

A. O. TAIT: The chief ~~trouble~~ I have with the "is not" part of it is the trouble I have with the devil all the time.

H. C. LACEY: But that is his manifestation.

Now in verse 12 it says: "And the ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast." I cannot help taking my stand back in John's day, and I have to differ with my dear Brother Wilcox on that. The ten horns of the sixth head, Pagan Rome divided, were to last right down to the coming of Christ, to receive power as kings one hour with the beast. These have one mind and shall give their power and strength unto the beast. Here is where John supplements Daniel. Daniel tells us that these ten horns should not cleave together. That is true. This text tells us they have received no kingdom as yet; but looking down to the end, they have one mind, and give their strength unto the beast. We

look forward to a time when the tne horns will beoome united as the United States of Europe, or something like that, at least outwardly, and give their strength to the beast, Satan. Is it not likely if a ~~majastin~~ being of majestic brightness appears and claims to be Christ, that the whole world will be deceived and accept him as king? Isn't it likely that Paganism, the Papacy, and Apostate Protestantism will unite, as "Great Controversy" says, and give their support to the beast? In Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 it says that "many nations shall come, and say, Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us his ways." I think that points forward to the time when there will be just such developments in Europe, when the nations will come together and unite under Satan.

A.C.DANIELLS: You do not mean that they will consolidate as one kingdom, but, rather, that they will unite in their great objective or purpose.

H.C.LACEY: Yes, that is it. It says they will receive power as kings one hour with the beast. I do not think they will beoome one kingdom, but it will be the United States of Europe,--not one kingdom, but all headed by Satan for a short time.

It says they shall have power "one hour." If it said an hour, I should think that was indefinite, but it says "one hour." A day in prophecy represents a year; an hour is a 24th part of a day, or 15 days. On the strength of that I am willing to suggest, and put a question mark after it, that the period during which Satan is here, and practically accepted as king, is a period of 15 days.

Now suppose Satan appeared in London, for instance. Some would believe on him at once, and after the passage of a few weeks or months--for I assume that is during the plagues--the time comes

when the British Empire is willing to acknowledge that this is the Christ, and that His millennium is about to be established. They then give their power and strength to the beast. Here is France, the republic. It will do the same, and so will Germany.

What are 15 days?--Three Sundays. The controversy is over Sunday, and the enforcement is the enforcement of the mark of the beast, the Sunday institution. The only real opponents Satan has at this time will be the 144,000. They are widespread, all over the world, and they will insist, in the face of every manifestation of power, that this is Satan. Suppose that Satan heals the sick and performs many other miracles such as Christ performed when here on earth. The two things that prove that he is not Christ are that he does not appear in the clouds of heaven, and that he changed the Sabbath. Those two points prove to the 144,000 that this great being is not Christ, and they continue to refuse to accept him. With what hatred must the 144,000 be regarded by the people!

(LACEY--Cont'd)

It is difficult under such circumstances to say that there will be a universal death decree. Everybody is willing to admit that this is the case. I think you can see how under such circumstances it would be considerably difficult for the death decree to be issued.

At this time Satan impersonates Christ, and as such makes the decree "That those mine enemies who will not have me to rule over them shall be put to death", this statement being in counterfeit of the words of Christ himself when speaking of the second coming of the Son of Man. So Satan will find a biblical justification for the universal death decree against the people of God who refuse to worship him.

I say that these fifteen days come in right there. Notice, there are three Sundaye in this period of time. Sunday is the Sabbath of the professed Christian church, celebrated from midnight to midnight. Now an opportunity is given to the one hundred and forty four thousand to turn to Christ (?) and observe the Sabbath. They are given a little time to repent. They are told they must observe the next Sabbath. Sunday passes, and they are still obstinate and refuse the mercies of the Christ. Another opportunity is given them, but when the next ~~Sabbath~~ Sunday comes around they are still firm. Then the ~~decreed~~ decree is issued that at midnight of the next Sunday if they do not repent, they are to be put to death all over the world at the midnight hour.

Now that brings us to the next verse (vs. 14) "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for

that he is Lord of lords, and King of kings; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful."

Now the only way I can understand they make war with the Lamb, is that the kings of the earth war upon God's people by this death decree; and then Jesus himself comes down to fight for them. It is the continuance of the old controversy between the Lamb and the Dragon, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ which has been going on through earth's history against the people of the Lamb after Satan was cast out of heaven. And when this decree is made against God's people it is a decree against the Lamb who is represented by the 144,000. It is at midnight that the Lord's voice is heard which delivers the 144,000, and proclaims the day and hour of ~~that~~ Christ's coming (spoken of in Great Controversy).

VOICE: Is that the Battle of Armageddon?

LACEY: As I understand it, the Great Controversy presents a situation quite largely as it shall be centered here in the United States. The Battle of Armageddon is to take place over in Europe. Religious persecution of course is all over the world, but especially so in the United States. Here is the center of the controversy, and Great Controversy represents what is going on here. Over in Europe there is a fight going on, and here in the United States religious persecution is raging.

After those fifteen days there is a little gap. Here I put in the six weeks. It says in Great Controversy: "the voice of God is heard proclaiming the day and hour of Christ's coming." He does not come at the midnight hour, but comes certain days after. Brother Haske ll suggests there is a period of six weeks between these two. That was the time Jesus was on the earth from the time between his resurrection and ascension.

After the voice is heard at midnight, the saints are delivered 832
and remain on the earth until Christ comes. And the next verses
portray what takes place during these six weeks. (I omit the
15th verse as that is only explanatory)

16th vs.: "And the ten horns which thou sawest upon
the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her
desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her
with fire." You remember, that is what is said in Early Writings
and Great Controversy, happens after this midnight cry. After
God's people are delivered, the people of the world then turn
upon these false religious teachers. Thus these horns turn upon
the woman. They turn upon their ministers that have taught them
false doctrines.

QUESTION: From where do the six weeks begin?

LACEY: That is only a speculation, a suggestion from Brother
Haskell, as I said. It is from that midnight hour when
the voice of God ~~terminates~~ terminates the fifteen days' persecu-
tion of the people of God. Great Controversy declares it "the
hour and day of Jesus coming," which makes it more than one day.
We cannot tell how many days. There appears to be a little lapse of
time.

TAIT: It was suggested that the analogy of the flood
would make it seven days.

LACEY: I never got that, but you remember Brother Haske ll
suggested the plagues are going to repeat the experience of
Christ himself in the last days; so I always put the six
weeks with a questionmark after it.

During that period occurs this verse, and (the 16th) and
this is the objective point. The angel says: "I will show

these the judgment of the great whore." And it is at the moment of her greatest triumph that she is judged. The ten horns turn upon her and make her desolate, and burn her with fire. It was the way they treated a woman of this character in ancient times, and it carries out the figure here given. There is a revulsion of feeling against her, and a turning of the persecution. Instead of the people turning upon the people of God they turn upon their false teachers.

~~LACEY~~ the 17th verse: "For God hath put ~~in~~ it in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the Beast, until the word of God shall be fulfilled." All this is simply the carrying out of the divine purpose. It is the time of the separation of the tares from the wheat. It is the time when the wicked are revealed in their true light. It is the time when the final distinction is made, that could not be made while the wheat and the tares grew together.

VOICE: Is the experience of the 16th verse the same as the 18th chapter.

LACEY: Practically so, ~~yes~~ yes. It (the eighteenth chapter) is an enlargement of this verse (the sixteenth)

UNDERWOOD: Do you apply these fifteen days after probation has closed?

LACEY: Yes, it is at the end of the ~~sixth~~ sixth plague.

May I turn to Revelation 16, verse 17? "And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done." The ~~plague~~ seventh plague is here introduced. The Great Controversy makes the fulfillment of this at the midnight hour when the voice of God ~~proclaimed the day and hour of~~ ~~xxxxxxx~~ said, "It is done." Then the world is turned upside down, and "there were heard thunderings, and voices, and earthquakes and mysterious voices proclaiming the doom of the wicked." So we know where we are. That is the sixth plague. It is that midnight hour, and that is the end of the fifteen days--if we take this one hour as prophetic time. This is just before the seventh plague breaks out.

VOICE: Instead of the six weeks, does it not say in the eighteenth chapter, "In one hour is her judgment come?"

LACEY: It does say, "In one hour is her judgment come." That is right, and it may be that is one hour instead of six weeks. I say that is only a speculation of the six weeks. I have looked for an explanation of it in Great Controversy, but failed to find it.

THERE is one other point in the exposition of this verse I would like to call attention to (15th verse) "The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Now if you take this to represent Satan deceiving the whole world that language is inapplicable. How could the world be represented as individual inhabitants by "waters". It could not be. But as you consider it to represent the seventh great beast, it is perfectly clear in regard to the woman sitting upon the waters.