

PRESCOTT

I understand that these are to be Bible studies, and not sermons. I shall ask you to join with me in the study, in the reading, and hope you will have Bibles at hand, and will be present to read at any time any scripture that may be called for, and if so, we may enter into the work not as preachers, but as those who are to study simply under a leader.

I have been asked to lead in the study upon the person of Christ. I have been much embarrassed to know how to deal with this subject in the brief time that is necessarily allotted to the field. It can at best be only suggestive, but I would like to say this at the start, that my purpose in my own study of this theme and in anything I may present, will not be to present a theory about the person of Christ, but to come to a knowledge of him, to learn how we shall deal with him, and to see how this viewpoint will effect our study of the Bible and our teaching and preaching of the Bible. I ask that you will bear that in mind, that this viewpoint may have a very decided bearing upon the question of our own personal study of the Bible, and then necessarily upon our method of presenting the gospel. I ask you to bear that in mind.

Revelation 14:6: gives the foundation of this message.
Reading from the Revised Version:

"And I saw another angel flying in mid-heaven, having eternal good tidings to proclaim unto them that dwell on the earth, and unto every nation and tribe and tongue and people."

What follows is a development of the everlasting gospel and what conditions are created by the everlasting gospel, both for and against it, the fall of Babylon, the people who keep the commandments of God. But what I want to emphasize is that the message that we are to proclaim is the everlasting gospel.

Romans 1:1, 3, omitting, I think, the second verse.

"Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God . . . concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh."

A definition, as it were, of the gospel. "The gospel of God concerning his son. We have other definitions of the gospel -- "The power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth"-- but that grows out of this. This I take to be a fundamental statement. The gospel is the good news concerning his son, and our experience in the gospel depends upon our personal attitude toward his son. That is the primary thing. Out of that will come all doctrines, all experiences, but primarily the gospel is the good news to this world concerning his son. Our acceptance of the gospel is our acceptance of that good news; and that means actually the acceptance of the person of the one this good news speaks. But I want to emphasize those things. The everlasting gospel is this message. The same gospel as of old, the gospel is the gospel concerning his son. Now let us read another scripture, 1 Cor. 15:1-4 (R.V.)

Now what is the primary thing, a thing that he received and that he delivered to them first of all? It was facts concerning the person of Christ. The death of Christ, the fact that he was buried and knew he was dead. The fact that he was raised from the dead. Christ died and rose from the dead. That is what he delivered to them first. That is fundamental in the gospel, and in his letter to the Galatians in the fifth chapter. You remember the purpose of this epistle. He came and set forth Christ openly crucified among them. Some one else came and wished to add on something to that gospel, and their message was Christ and . That was the message from Jerusalem too, from the leaders. Paul withstood that message because he said it was contrary to the truth of the gospel. He even withstood Peter to his face because he went not according to the truth of the gospel of the son of God. Now summing up at the end, fifth chapter, second verse:

"Behold, I Paul say unto you, that, if ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing."

Now when he came to sum up the situation in these chapters, what was it? It was a question whether they had Christ or whether he profited them nothing. Whether they were in fellowship with Christ or severed from Christ. If they submitted to this new gospel of Christ and,—they were severed from Christ, and that is the end of the gospel when they are severed from that person.

I wanted this as introductory to the subject. I feel that this subject is fundamental, and I believe it should have a very

definite influence upon our personal study of the scriptures and upon our writing, preaching, teaching, and that it should have a very definite bearing upon the influence of our courses of Bible study in our schools.

Now let us consider this question of Christ in the gospel as a part of a larger field. Personally I have found great help in looking at it in this way. I look at it this way: Here is this period of sin. We will say it is represented for us by this ruler. ^{It} Then comes in between two eternities. During this period, no new principles of the character of God are introduced, nothing new concerning the character, the purpose of God, are introduced. The same principles that belong in this eternity and that will be true in this eternity are true in this limited portion of time. It is simply a question of the application of those principles to peculiar circumstances during this time. That is what constituted the application of the good news concerning the son of God. During a part of this ^{eternity} ~~time~~ he himself was manifested in time. The most remarkable mystery of the gospel, that he who is from eternity to eternity should actually be manifested in time, so that finite creatures could deal with him as manifested in time out of those double eternities.

Let us read in the epistle of Colossians. It is upon this foundation that the Apostle places his gospel of salvation.

Col. 1:12: "Giving thanks unto the Father, who made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love." Note that he uses the word

Son here, 'not the kingdom of Christ nor the kingdom of God. This particular expression has its force here, as the use of the word Son in Romans, as we read, "The gospel of God concerning his Son." Not Jesus Christ, but his Son. "Were translated out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of the Son of his love. In whom"-- observe the expression -- "we have our redemption." That is sufficient. That covers it all. And that redemption we have in him has a distinction from a doctrine about him. That redemption is in him. "In whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins." "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of all creation". For in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him." (Revised Version, Col 1:15-17)

"In him." The distinction is worthy of careful attention. "In him." "Through him," "unto him," all things are created. Seventeenth verse: "And he is before all things, and in him all things consist," or subsist, or hold together, or maintain their existence. In the 17th verse the expression is "before all things." This is more than an expression of time. It is an expression of time, but it is much more than that. Time grows out of the other. In the person of his Son, all things have their existence and upon his pre-existence the existence of all visible things depend. We have the expression in the third of Revelation, "The beginning of the Creation of God. Some have used that text to prove that Christ was a created being,

a

6-8

7/2

trying to parry the force of the text by saying we should say beginning. No. "He is before all things." There would be no visible things except for his pre-existence, and when the only-begotten came into the world, all manifestations that have appeared since that time were potentially in him.

And all visible things are but the manifestation to finite beings capable of being comprehended by the senses granted to created beings, or what was really in Him before He appeared in these visible forms. In Him all things hold together, subsist, have their existence. That is, His pre-existence is the existence of all things that now exist, that are visible to us. His continued existence is the condition upon which all present things continue to exist.

Now, why is that of any importance to us? That is the very foundation upon which he rested the statement. The existence of all things that now exist in material forms,--things visible and things invisible,--are based upon the pre-existence of Christ. The Son existed before all these things existed in time, and as an absolute essential condition of their existence. Why should we emphasize that? That is what He lays down here as the foundation of His gospel. That is why in Him we have redemption, for in Him this is true.

First "in Him," then "through Him," then "unto Him":

"Through Him": He was the agent through Whom all things came into being. "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made." That is the very foundation of our hope of the gospel, of salvation.

"Unto Him": As "in Him," "through Him," so "unto Him." All things return unto Him, and you have, as it were, the circle in creation. It is the very same as we have it in the whole Bible, because when you have gone through the whole Scripture to the 22nd chapter of Revelation, you come back to the first chapter of Genesis, when you have gone the circle of creation, you come back to the beginning. He is the beginning and the ending. We read in the first

chapter of John's gospel, "In the beginning the Word was." There is a great difference in the way you read that. We have to have the beginning of things. To us, there is a beginning; but when you strike that which to us was the beginning, you can look back and say the word was, with no time limit at all. It is because the Word was at that time that we call the beginning, that the beginning came, and that all things have come since the beginning, and that all things are now in our period of existence that we measure by time as finite beings must do.

It is because He was at that time that we call the beginning that we can rest our confidence upon Him as our Saviour, and upon no other basis. Therefore, in writing to the Colossians, where this error of gnosticism was creeping in,--a false interpretation of the question of creation,--that He pointed out to them that the foundation of the gospel rested there, and that a perversion of that was a perversion of the gospel.

We face the same thing today. It has been true all the time, that any error concerning the literal creation of the world leads to an error concerning the gospel. That is the basis of gnosticism,--new ideas concerning the relation of the Son of God to creation. And therefore He points out in this chapter that the Son of God is not a created being.

He does not use the term gnosticism, but he is meeting that error. We have the same situation today,--that is, such theories concerning the relation of God to material things; and we need to come back to this very same truth, that an error concerning creation is a certain error concerning the gospel; and for

this reason this period of time during which sin appears in the world is not a separate period to be taken apart from the two eternities, but must be considered in the light of those eternities, and the principles that applied before this period must be applied here, and the principles that applied before will be applied to all eternity.

Therefore, I regard this question of the person of Christ as fundamental to the whole question of the truth of the gospel, and notably so now in the situation that we face and the crisis that we have to deal with.

Not dwelling upon that further, but turning now to Luke 19:10: "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Here is a period of time during which a special work is done. Something has been lost. That which was lost is to be regained, and for that purpose the Son of man--notice the term--comes "to seek and to save that which was lost." Now we have in some places, as in 1 John 3:8, "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested." Now it is the "Son of man," and there is a difference in the use of the term. "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."

Now refer to Eph. 1:9, 10. We have to break into this sentence: "Making known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he purposed in him unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth;" Now, if you will read this epistle to the Ephesians right through, and just note the number of times this expression occurs,--"In Christ,"

"in Him," "in Whom,"-you will find this whole epistle to be an exposition of the third verse: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ."

The point I want to especially emphasize is the 10th verse. The expression used here is "to sum up all things in Christ." You have the Greek Testament, Brother Howell, and you see that that word means "to head up." We take the Latin word capit, which means head, and we put it into the verb, and we say "recapitulate" when we mean to sum up the whole argument. That does not exactly bring out the idea. If we could use the word to re-head all things in Christ, it would express the idea.

The first Adam was placed as the head of creation, the vices-gerent of God. He was crowned as king, crowned with glory and honor. He lost that place; but the purpose of God that a man shall ~~xxx~~ be the head of this world in creation is not set aside at all, but in order that that purpose shall be carried out, His own Son becomss the man, the second Adam; and now it is His purpose to re-head all things in Christ, this person.

Our relation to Him, as to whether we acknowledge Him as the new head or whether we accept ~~Him~~ the god of this world who has obtained the headship, is wholly a question of our personal experience. It is not a question of assenting to some doctrines or some creed. Here is God's eternal purpose. Our relation to that eternal purpose as He is working it out in the person of His Son, is the whole question of our religion. If we acknowledge Christ to be the new head, and therefore accept Him as our head,

BPF

-12-a-
-13-

7-2-19

and accept the Scriptures statement, "Christ is the head of every man," that gives Him His place in this scheme. To do that means absolute surrender of self, absolute denial of the god of this world, absolute rejection of all the principles of the kingdom of this world, and a practical adoption in the life of the principles of the kingdom of which He is the head. That is religion. That means a very definite personal experience in this question of relation to God's eternal purpose.

Passing on now, turn to Acts 10:36. When Peter is preaching for the first time to the Gentiles, what does he set forth? This is the first going out of the gospel to the Gentiles, also to Cornelius. Verse 36: "The word which he sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ (he is Lord of all)--" Note the double force of that statement: First, his lordship; second, the extent of his lordship. Peter is preaching to the Gentiles. It is a question as to whether the gospel is to go to the Gentiles. Christ is the new head, but not of the Jews only.--He is Lord of all. That is the gospel, that is the good news.

2 Cor. 4:5: Here we have a little touch that I like in the Revised version. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord"--who, who is Lord of all." We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus is Lord.

Now there are various phases of preaching Christ. This one is fundamental. This is the foundation truth. He is Lord of all. To submit to his rule is to be a Christian. To refuse his rule is to belong to the synagogue of Satan. There are two camps, just as real as in any war here upon earth. We are to view these things not as theoretical theories, but as actual facts in which we act a part; and that is what will settle the whole question of, our personal experience. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus is Lord."

Phil. 2: --This brings us to the triumphs. In the early part of the chapter, after he has spoken of Christ having taken the flesh, humanity,--9th to 11th verses. "Wherefore"-- because he became obedient even unto death, even the death on the cross, "wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him the name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus"-- why Jesus rather than Christ? Why in the name of Jesus? It is not now in the name of Christ, in the ~~name~~ name of the Son. It is in the name of Jesus Christ--Why? He has just told of his humility, being made in the likeness of man. Now the same one who was made in the likeness of man, the same One that thought it not a prize to be grasped to remain on equality with God, who emptied himself and took upon himself the form of a servant--that is Jesus; that in the name of that very person, Jesus, "every knee should bow. . .and every tongue

confess" that Jesus the Christ, "Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

Now from these simple Scriptures that I have read we see the field that I am leading to. The everlasting gospel, the gospel of God concerning his Son. His purpose is to reconcile all things in Christ, because in him all things are created. Now we must bear in mind that until he came into the world in this form there was not that distinction which we make between nature and grace, between natural and spiritual. It is sin that has brought that distinction to us. Before that all things were spiritual. All things were natural, but all things were spiritual, and there was not that distinction to be drawn between nature and grace, between natural and spiritual. Sin brought in that gap, that distinction. Now we have to recognize that distinction. Now he proposes to reconcile all things in Christ, and when that purpose is accomplished all things will be spiritual, all things will be natural, too, but they will be spiritual. There will not be that distinction to draw between them.

Now it is his purpose that the Son shall be the head; that he shall be Lord, and it shall be to the glory of God the Father. The question of our religion is not the question of our defending a creed; it is not a question of our proving that we teach doctrines in harmony with this book. Religion is a question of personal relation to a person. Out of that all doctrines will come. Upon that we have a living creed, and a living creed is always quivering -- you cannot put it into a mold. A living creed means growth, advancement

constantly. And when one grows he does not nullify what he was born with. Because a boy increases in weight, he does not spoil what he has grown before. So with a person who grows in the Christian life -- he does not repudiate the growth already made, but he will be more than he was before of the same kind, and not contradict himself. The new growth created will not contradict itself, will not set aside fundamental things and get a new foundation. It will be a growth, it will be a life. The problem, of course, is how shall we deal with this question from this standpoint. This will ~~govern~~ govern the whole question of our personal study, of our teaching, of our writing, of our preaching -- just how we relate ourselves to these simple facts that I have stated will determine whether we view things from the standpoint of doctrine, the standpoint of certain subjects that make up the gospel, or whether we view it from this one standpoint, the person of Christ and our relation to that person; and that out of that all doctrines shall be developed, and upon that all teachings shall be based. Now we will try to develop the same and more as we proceed.

Now let me call attention to another simple Scripture so familiar -- John 14:6. This is the answer of Jesus. "Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how know we the way? Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life." That is, the way is not a path apart from ^{the} a person. The person is the way. Through him we have access to one spirit unto the Father, and He is our only way to God. He was the only way out for God. If we can conceive this idea: When God the Father went forth he went

forth in the person of his Son. He himself is the way, and there is no other way back to God than by the way He manifested himself. He is the way. "I am the truth." Truth is more than a statement of fact. If I say, "I release my hand upon this ruler and it drops upon the table," that is a fact. That statement is true. That is not truth as spoken of in the Scriptures. That is not truth as it is in Jesus, because truth is a living reality. The law was given by Moses, but grace and reality came through Jesus Christ. Truth is a personality. All truth is in Him, and apart from Him all is false. That is the difference between semblance and reality. Sin is a semblance. Satan is a semblance, an appearance, a sham. Christ is reality. That is the contrast. It is in the person and what goes out from this person. To apprehend Christ as the person of truth, the reality, not a sham, not a mere appearance, not a shell that when one takes hold of it it will break and be found empty; but in him as a person is found all that is real.

Now it immediately follows from this that any one who pretends to have any truth outside of Christ is caught in a lie. That is the basis of all heathenism. They exchange the truth of God for a lie. If you look at that text in Romans -- you look at it, Brother Howell. Romans 1:25 is the philosophy of all heathenism, whether in China or in the United States. You look, Brother Howell, and see if you do not find the definite article ----- (Greek word mentioned) (Professor Howell: Yes.) Now, instead of "they changed the truth of God into a lie," they exchanged the truth of God

into the lie." What is the lie? 2 Thess. 2: After setting forth this description of the man of sin who sets himself up above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God, Then what? -- Ninth and tenth verses: "Whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error that they should believe the lie." Isn't it -- Answer, Yes Sir. What is the lie? It is putting something else in the place of God. The lie that has caught the world is described here as the man who sets himself forth as God. That is the lie. What is the truth? That Christ is God. Here we face the message against the beast and his image. What is the lie? -- Some one else in the place of the manifestation of God according to Christ. What is the truth? Christ in the manifestation of God. Does not that attach something else to our message against the beast and his image? We are not to magnify the lie, but we are to magnify Him who is the truth; and that will be the answer to the lie. All lies or falsehoods are summed up there. Isaiah says the one that has the mark of the image in his right hand is a lie. He is the truth. We are to magnify Him, the person, as the truth. And then we are to reveal the truth in our life. It is not sufficient to know what is truth. The truth is to be revealed in our lives. The truth is that Christ is Lord of all -- Lord of me. That is the truth. That truth must be revealed in my life before that person can be revealed in my life; and the only way that that truth can be revealed in my life is that the

person who is the truth shall be there himself and reveal it. "I am the way, the truth, the life." The person is Christ. Amen.

Intermission

*Elder M. C. Wilcox's
paper followed.*

Then C. P. Bollman.

PRINCIPLES OF PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION

by

M. G. Wilcox.

Principles are greater than facts. They are to the student of the Holy Scriptures what the "blue print" is to the builder. The "blue print" enables the builder to place the many parts--often puzzling, individually and collectively considered, many quite similar--just where they belong in the finished structure. One timber is ten feet two and one-eighth inches long; another ten feet two and five-eighths inches long. Otherwise their dimensions are the same. The difference is the mere matter of half an inch, but in accurate measurement in a perfect structure, the little difference is vital. The blue print shows the place of each and both. We might crowd, hammer, and bolt them in out of place, but the frame is warped, its perfection marred, and the structure is inharmonious. The builder himself deteriorates in character by doing such faulty work. The following of the accurate measurements of the "blue print" would have saved him the fatal blunder.

There are many facts of scripture which do not place themselves. Left to mere human conjecture, unguided by true principles of interpretation, men are liable to go astray in the placing of the fact. The fact is helpful in its own place. It is embarrassing if out of place, and its wrong application blinds the judgment and obscures the vision of him who so errs.

I will not attempt to enumerate all the great principles of interpretation. The task would be too great, and we would not have time to consider them. These which follow will perhaps be sufficient.

to illustrate at least the importance of the blue print in the study of doctrinal questions.

1. The Unity of the Word

The sixtysix books, or tracts, as they have been called, are one book and have one author. They were given, it is true, through two score channels--more or less-- and these books are stamped with the individual characteristics of the respective writers, but the author is divine. It was the eternal Word by the Spirit moving upon the men who wrote. These books are written in the words used by Moses, Samuel, Nathan, Joel, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Matthew, John, Paul, and the others; nevertheless the collection of these books are "the Word of Jehovah," "the Scriptures of Truth," "the Holy Scriptures." "The Spirit of Jehovah spake by me," said David, "and his word was upon my tongue." 2Sam.23:2. "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth," says Paul. 1Cor.2:13. "Which the Holy Spirit spake before by the mouth of David concerning Jesus," says Peter. Acts 1:16. See also 1Peter.1:11, 2 Peter 2:21; 2 Tim. 3:16, et al. It is not the opinion of Moses or Isaiah or Jeremiah or Paul or Peter, or what these men think ; it is the word of God.

It is the great Master Musician using all the various instruments on which to give to the world the harmonies of God. It may be a Jew's harp, a trombone, an organ, a piano; The music is that of the Master Musician speaking through the various instruments; or, to use another figure, the Master Architect building the temple of divine revelation by the different builders.

2. One Teaching

The Bible is one doctrine, one teaching, with its correlated parts. Sometimes we make these parts stand out as almost separate and unrelated doctrines, but they are all one and are ever known as one doctrine, or better, perhaps, as one teaching of God. "Doctrines"--plural--is left to error. Jehovah is one, "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever," one omniscient, omnipresent, all-wise God of love and justice and mercy. He has one moral standard of righteousness, of character. The Bible knows but one all-sufficient Sacrifice and Saviour. The great divine plan binds together with the crimson and golden cords of truth and love the whole structure of His Word. It is divine and human even as its Giver, Christ Jesus is divine and human.

3. The Law of First Mention

By this we mean that the first mention of any great or important fact, event, or teaching carries that primary meaning throughout the Word. This must be in order to preserve the divine unity. The rule of the builder must be the same throughout. Elsewise we are left to conjecture and guess work. To illustrate: (a) "In the beginning," that unmeasured period antedating the six days of Genesis, gives the meaning to that expression in all subsequent passages, as in Prov. 8:22,23; John 1:1. (b) The sanctification of the seventh day, the origin of the Sabbath. Gen. 2:2,3. (c) The marriage relation. Gen. 2:18-24; Matt. 19:3-8. (d) The creation of man, the serpent, the fall of man, the Deluge, are a few other instances of what holds good throughout the Bible. The first mention expresses the divine thought not alone for that passage, but for the future.

4. The Law of Comparative Mention

The first mention, while revealing the principle of terminology in unity, does not always express the full meaning. This can be learned only by comparing all the passages upon the subject. The primal meaning is not changed, but modified, developed, as the Sabbath question, and the fall of man, for instance. To base all upon one mention only might lead us into extreme position.

5. The Law of Full Mention

The first mention of a fact or event or phase of truth is not always, or perhaps generally, a full mention, especially as so many of the first mentions are found in the marvelously condensed book of Genesis. But somewhere in the Word the thing is more fully developed, as for instance, the Seed of Gen.3:15, more fully developed in Galatians 3. Yet in the fuller development the primal thought holds.

6. The Law of Illustrative Mention

Oftentimes the great thought or phase of truth is illustrated, as in the parable of the sower, the wheat and the tares, (Matt. 13), the Good Shepherd (John 10).

7. The Word Paramount

The Word of God must be always paramount. Whatever devout men may hold, or have held, whatever may be the views of politicians, statesmen, or philosophers, however reasonable or plausible the views or opinions of these men may be, the Word of God is, and must be, paramount, although its verification or fulfilment may seem to human reason far away or humanly improbable. Depending upon the sayings or reasonings of men for the elucidation or fulfilment of

the Word, there is danger of making men paramount, or of narrowing and crystallizing the meaning of the expanding truth of God. It has been well said by a recent writer: "It is better to keep within the Bible itself for the settlement of its problems; and to treat the whole Book as the context of all its parts."

--"Companion Bible," Note at Beginning of Book of Job. The center and circumference of that word is Christ, the Alpha and Omega, a personal Saviour, Friend, and Guide.

8. Revealed, Not Reasoned Out.

Prophecy is given to the children of men that they may know what no human knowledge, reasonings, or teachings can tell them, of what shall come to pass hereafter.

There are many guesses made by the world, ^wmay political forecasts made of coming events. Some of them, read in the light of the lesson of causes and effects, in past history are in a general way remarkably correct, but nearly all fall wide of the mark and fail in the crucial test. The things predicated of God are usually the things which the heart of the world does not desire, nor its wisdom expect. And therefore, as expressed by the historian, John Clark Ridpath: "The tallest son of the morning can not tell a day before they take place, the events that occur." If men could know of themselves, we would not need the "more sure word of prophecy, which shineth as a light in a dark place, until the day dawn," and the day star arise in the hearts of the children of God.

Had the world known what God found it necessary to predict, they would not have crucified the Lord's Christ, persecuted His followers, nor ever have united church and state.

9. Aid of the Spirit

The same Spirit that inspires the Word is essential also to the understanding and interpretation of the revelation. Apart from the enlightenment of that Spirit, the wisest of men flounder in human conjectures and uncertainties. It is to definite prophecy, aided by the Spirit, not to the world, we must look for light. But note this, the Spirit does not lead us contrary to the Word. See 1 Cor. 2:6-16.

10. Not of Private Interpretation

It is a declaration of inspiration that "No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." 2 Peter 1:21. Here are other renderings: "No prophecy of the Scripture becometh self-solving." --Rotherham. "No prophecy is an exposition of its own text." --Syriac. "No prophecy of the Scripture is of special interpretation." --A.R.V., Margin. "No prophecy of the Scripture comes of one's own interpretation." --Baptist Version.

In other words, the same general principles must guide in all prophetic interpretation. In all great prophecies there are found symbols, descriptions, inspired explanations, and terms which will aid in the right understanding of each prophecy. Parallel descriptions and terminology should be given proper weight. Right interpretations and expositions are not inconsistent and contradictory. They do not devour each other. The one Spirit guides them all.

Under this head may be mentioned "Arbitrary Interpretation," a curse of the ages, which we unsparingly condemn in others, and justly so. When we are told that "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," we believe it to be utterly unjustifiable to say that the Word means a seventh day, or any seventh day, after six of labor. In other words the Bible must be allowed to

explain itself. If prophetic, wait for the fulfilment of its predictions instead of looking for some prophecy to fulfil a certain event in our field of vision, but which in God's plan and purpose is of little import. Let us see things little which God sees little and things great which He sees great. 1 Cor.1:18-

11. Conditional

Some prophecies are conditional. These conditions, noted in different places, are clearly stated in Jer. 18:7-10. If a nation or people complies with God's terms, there is blessing, healing, and building. If the nation or people fail, the curse, the decay, the blasting, the destruction follow. Ignoring conditional prophecy, many are led astray regarding the future of the Hebrews, or Jews. Giving heed to the principle, one will be saved from shipwreck. Our boat will be kept clear from the rocks which have wrecked others, and toward which many are drifting to-day.

The prophecies to Israel may be summed up under three heads, as stated many years ago by Elder J.H. Waggoner:

(a) The prophecy is conditional, based on Israel's obedience to God.

(b) Some of the prophecies regarding the Jews were fulfilled in the restoration from the Babylonian captivity.

(c) Those yet to be fulfilled will be and must be fulfilled under new covenant conditions, since our Lord came. Consequently all unfilled prophecies which pertain to national Israel are conditional prophecies that can never be fulfilled to them as such. Heeding this will save us from great blunders.

12. Later Light

Some of the prophecies of the Old Testament seem to convey

the idea that Israelites (the Hebrews) are to be restored as a nation, and that in the last days they will be a separate people from the Gentiles, and that the Lord will use them for the salvation of the Gentiles in the last days. These erroneous views are based upon Old Testament prophecies alone. We will never read them aright until we read them in the light of the meaning of the origin of the name Israel, and the later revelations from God. Upon this we read: "How that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery. . . . that in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men as it hath now been revealed unto us His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, to-wit: that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the Gospel." Eph. 3:3-6.

13. Nations and Persons

God's judgments on nations and individuals should not be confounded. A nation may and does close its career in God's plan, while the probation of individuals in that nation continues. When the chiefs of the Jewish nation rejected Jesus, and confirmed that rejection by saying, "We have no king but Caesar," the right of that nation to exist had ceased. But God was still calling every individual soul, as proved over and over again by the apostle Paul. So when this nation, or any other for that matter, turns from the light that God gives, and exalts itself in place of God, it passes its day of grace, and stands where God can care for it no longer. The destruction of nations in general comes under the plague and at our Lord's advent. In the very nature of the case, there will be no individual nations in the resurrection of the unjust.

The judgment of persons will then occur. Let not the two be confounded.

14. Double Prophecy

Many of the prophecies of the Old Testament are double prophecies in which the local conditions of the prophet's time are so blended with greater future events that it is impossible to separate them, and we never can get a right understanding unless we recognize the fact that the prophecy is double. In other words, the foreground of the prophet blends with the larger and far future field, so that the objects seem as one. The nearer mountain seems one with the more distant peak or ridge. All blend in the far horizon. But if we were to climb the nearer mountains, we would find, perhaps, great valleys separating us from the higher elevations. The vision does not show the intervening valleys. The prophet sees the smaller, nearer mountain scenery blending with a far distant peak, making one mountain, seemingly, of the two. It is only by the aid of the Spirit of God that we can divide between the local and far-reaching prophecies. Sometimes we must wait for fulfilment.

15. Great Moral Principles

In every line of prophecy there are great moral principles of God's truth. If in the prophecy itself there is not that which gives convicting power to the message of God for the time, we may know that the interpretation is not of God. The true will lead to the great moral principles obligatory and permanent in the day of prophetic fulfilment. If these are minimized, the interpretation is wrong. These moral principles fall within the prophecy itself. Note these in the great lines of prophecy. To illustrate: In Daniel 2 and 3, we have the ambitions of men

set over against the revelation of truth, the kingdom of God and its holy principles set over against the principles of evil that tend only to decay and destruction. We have the deteriorating kingdom of men, and the everlasting kingdom of God. In Daniel 7 the principles and outworking of the union of church and state set over against the judgment of God, the law of God, and the people of God.

In Daniel 8 and 9 are the true Saviour and His mediator-ship set over against the false man-made-saviours and their mediation which can not take away sin. There is a great moral principle embodied in every prophecy.

13 Evidence Cumulative

Every prophetic message goes prophetically forward to its climax, to the close of probation or the second coming of Christ. The evidence prophetical of its fulfilment is continually increasing. Not in worldly wisdom or evidence, but in prophetic fulfilment is this true. It does not bring those who believe in its true interpretation to constantly expect its fulfilment to meet human demands and as constantly repeated disappointment. The true prophetic interpretation is never disappointing, never anticlimatic, nor is it reactionary. It is ever cumulative in its evidence, cumulative in its convincing power, goes steadily onward consonant with other prophecies, and waxes clearer and stronger to its culmination. It does not foster fanaticism nor build on the insecure and inconsistent foundations of speculative, private interpretation or opinions of men. It builds the believer on the everlasting Rock.

17. Willingness to Investigate

He who follows truth is willing to be fair, willing that any theory or opinion that he has should be brought to the test of the Word. He believes that God's pathway of light shines with constantly greater effulgence to the eye of faith to the perfect day. But it is a characteristic of error to appeal to tradition, to endeavor to conserve God's truth (or what men may so denominate) by fencing it about with an appeal to human interpretation, "the fathers have spoken," and to characterize as heretics, not those who hold fast to the Word, but who do not hold equally sacred the opinions of men, some of whom, perhaps all of whom, were true to all the light that shone in their day. God's truth can not be fixed by mete and bound of human mind. He has ever greater light. Open the heart to its beams, tested by His Word, and follow the light which "shineth more and more unto the perfect day." See "Danger of Rejecting Light," in "Gospel Workers."

18. Reasons for Prophetic Delineation

Dynasties, empires, kingdoms, governments are brought into the prophetic field for three chief reasons.

(a) Because of some connection or relation with the people of God, so as to affect their welfare or work, as Midian, Moab, Edom, Philistia, etc.

(b) Because they are world-dominant, world-moulding powers, empires, systems which greatly affect other powers, and also the people of God, as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, Rome, the United States.

(c) Nations are brought into prophecy because God uses them as scourges to apostate peoples and churches, as Assyria, Egypt, and small powers in Palestine, and the Saracens and Turks in later times.

19. Ending of Great Prophecies

All the great prophecies end in the glorious triumph of Christ

and His people, when to all worldly appearances and belief the triumph of error seems to be the triumph of truth. It demands faith, clear, strong faith to grasp the fulfilment despite appearances. To faith the evidence is clear and cumulative. But to the worldly view the triumph of worldly things is assured. The image of Daniel 2 is not the human view of the kingdom of men, but God's view. The image of Daniel 3 is man's view, a declaration of world-power still prevalent, viz., that the kingdom of man shall persist forever. Daniel 2 declares it will constantly change, and when it is world-embracing it will be struck by supernatural power and destroyed. Man will not expect that then, and no human reason could have marked out such a conclusion.

Never does a prophecy reverse this order by going from large to small, and imposing Christ's triumph on a sick and waning power. Rev. 6:13

20. Types and Symbols Small

The types, the shadows, the symbols of the Old Testament, the beginnings of prophecy, are small, confined, limited, but typical, symbolical, of world-wide antitypes. To illustrate: The ancient sanctuary was a simple house having to do only with the nation of Israel, but it typified God's temple in heaven, "not made with hands," the center of all world-worship. Little Palestine, smaller than most of the States of this Union, was--ie--a type of the ceaseless new earth and home of all God's people. One wicked Jezebel becomes a type of the great apostasy of centuries; and Elijah, a single man, prophet to the little ten-tribe kingdom of Israel, becomes a type of those who bear to all the nations of the world the last great threefold message of warning. Little Babylon, on the River Euphrates, becomes a type of the final organized kingdoms of darkness of the last days. The little king of the north becomes the type of a great overmastering confederacy.

21. World Dominion Not Territory

World-dominion, not territory, is the means of identification of world rule in the great prophetic chain of successive empires. Identical location is often involved, but it is not essential in identifying or determining earth rule. If it were, Rome would have no place to-day in the prophetic field as the successor of Babylon. To illustrate: Medo-Persia followed Babylon in world empire not because Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylon, placed his throne in Babylon or reigned in that city. As a matter of fact, the seat of his kingdom was elsewhere. Babylon was included in Persia, but the Persian empire included much more. Persia was the successor of Babylon because she was a world-dominant power.

Grecia succeeded Medo-Persia as a world-dominating power, but as a single united empire her seat of government was in Europe, far to the westward of Persia, at one time stretching to the east of Babylon, but afterward, especially in her divided state, abandoning virtually much of her eastern possessions. She succeeded Medo-Persia because she was world-dominant.

Rome succeeded Grecia, with her capital never in Asia. As a single united empire, she ruled over a greater territory than all her predecessors. Afterward, scourged by the Northern barbarians and weakened by wickedness and luxury, the empire was broken, the scepter of power and influence centering for a while in Constantinople, and afterward among the ten divisions of Western Rome. Western Rome was the great power of prophecy. The City of Rome became the religio-political center of the world empire, and the dominant center of the Eastern hemisphere in Western Europe today. We call these divisions England, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, etc., but the prophecy knows them as the successive phase of the brass of Grecia, the horns of

(Principles)

- 14 -

the great and terrible beast of Daniel 7, and the great eastern world-powers of to-day. But, mark it well, these powers, though great and mighty, did not virtually and nominally control any extent of territory held by the old Grecian Empire. And yet they have been dominant over these, and their dominancy has been recognized. It is world-dominance, and not territory, that identifies Roman succession.

More than this, when a world power loses its world-dominance, or independence, it is dropped from the prophecy unless its connection with the people of God shall demand its continuance for a time. For instance, Daniel 11:1,2 notes only four kings in Persia, seemingly on the face of it, all that would reign. As a fact, nearly half a score more reigned before we come to the last King Darius Codomanus. The prophecy does not note them all. It is not dealing with men as Kings, but with world-dominion. The prophecy jumps from Xerxes, the rich king, B.C.485, to Alexander the Great in B.C.336, a distance of time of more than a century and a quarter. Why?--Because Persia reached her greatest power and extent under Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 521-486. Xerxes sought to enlarge his dominion by a conquering career in Europe, and ignominiously failed. Persia was no longer a dominant aggressive world-power. Her world-moulding influence had passed forever. The dominant world-power was rising in little Macedonia, and therefore Alexander, the world-conqueror, the one destined of God to give the world a language for the Gospel is next noticed. The remaining kings of Persia had little or no effect upon world conquest or human destiny. Therefore Alexander died in B.C. 323, and prophecy bridges to the fourth division of Alexander's empire, B.C. 301, twenty-two years later.

It again bridges centuries in passing over the remaining kings of Syria after Antiochus IV, B.C. 164, passing Egypt, passing the

Roman Republic, to Roman persecution under the Papacy, of which Antiochus (IV) Epiphanes was a type, and rushes on to the last days, when world apostacy shall stand up against the Prince of princes, to be overthrown, when that Prince of Life, "Michael, shall stand up."

The above principles will, I hope, lead us to the development and outline of others. If by these brief suggestive statements, I have contributed toward this end, I shall be glad.

THE TEN KINGDOMS

C. P. Bollman

This presentation of the subject of the ten kingdoms is something which I undertake reluctantly, especially before so many of my brethren, every one of whom is probably just as familiar with the subject as I am, and a number of whom have doubtless given it special study.

The number ten is not mentioned in the second chapter of Daniel, and there is nothing in that chapter to indicate the number of parts into which Rome was to be divided, nevertheless that chapter may reasonably be made the starting point of a study of the ten kingdoms, because while that prophecy gives no hint of the number of parts it does tell us that the kingdoms would be divided, never to be reunited. The words of the angel to the prophet were:-

"Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." Verses 41-45.

Division is here symbolized not by the two feet or the ten toes, but by the presence in both the feet and toes of iron and clay, two elements that cannot be united as can many other substances, as for instance most of the metals, some of them forming alloys which are stronger ~~than~~ and more enduring than either alone. But this is not true of iron and clay. To me it has for many years seemed unwise to say that in this prophecy the ten toes represent the ten kingdoms, for it is nowhere so stated in the Scriptures. All things considered,

it seems better to adhere closely to the words of the prophecy: "Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided." The number ten, if mentioned at all in this connection, should be presented, not from the standpoint from the second chapter of Daniel, but from the prophecy of the seventh chapter, which covers the same ground but gives more detail. A part of this detail is the definite mention of the number of kingdoms into which the empire was to be divided prior to the rise of the eleventh or little horn, namely, ten. Says the prophet, "The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise." Here we are on solid ground so far as the number ten is concerned. Not only is the prophecy so plain as to leave no room for difference of opinion as to the tenfold original division, but there is no question of the location of all ten kings, or kingdoms in the Western Empire. The reasons of the great unanimity of opinion that exists here are thus stated by Sir Isaac Newton:-

Territory of
Fourth Beast

"As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time."

And therefore all the four beasts are still alive, though the dominion of the three first be taken away. The nations of Chaldea and Assyria are still the first beast. Those of Media and Persia are still the second beast. Those of Macedon, Greece and Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt, are still the third. And those of Europe, of this side Greece, are still the fourth. Seeing therefore the body of the third beast is confined to the nations on this side the River Euphrates, and the body of the fourth beast is confined to the nations on this side Greece; we are to look for all the four heads of the third beast, among the nations on this side of the river Euphrates; and for all the eleven horns

of the fourth beast, among the nations on this side of Greece. And therefor, at the breaking of the Greek Empire into four kingdoms of the Greeks, we include no part of the Chaldeans, Medes, and Persians in those kingdoms, because they belonged to the bodies of the two five beasts. Nor do we reckon the Greek Empire seated at Constantinople, among the horns of the fourth beast, because it belonged to the bodies of the two first beasts. Nor do we reckon the Greek Empire seated at Constantinople, among the horns of the fourth beast, because it belonged to the body of the third.-- "Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John." Sir Isaac Newton, Part I, chap. 4, pp. 31, 32.

It may be well at this point to locate as definitely as possible the boundaries of Western Rome before it was divided. In this we need only quote from Rev. E. B. Elliott, noting that he follows Gibbon:-

Territory of the 4th Beast "Beginning north from the Wall of Antoninus that separated England from Scotland, then following the Rhine up to its point of nearest proximity to the Danube source, i.e. half way between Strasburg and Basle; thence down the Danube to Belgrade; and thence in a southern course to Dyrrachium, and across the Adriatic and Mediterranean to the Syrtis Major and the Great Desert of Africa; It is to be understood that all to the eastward of this line belonged to the Constantinopolitan or Greek division of the empire; all westward, including England, France, Spain, and African Province, Italy and the countries between the Alps and the Rhine, Danube, and Save, anciently known under the names of Rhaetia, Noricum, and Pannonia in modern times as Switzerland, half Swabia, Bavaria, Austria, and the western part of Hungary,--to the Western or Roman division.--"Horae Apocalypticae," Rev. E. B. Elliott, A.M. Vol. III, p. 115.

It is only natural, having defined the boundaries of the territory in which the ten horns or ten kingdoms must be found among which the little horn was to arise, that we study the subject further and identify each of the political states that arose out of Rome at that time. However, we shall not find here the same agreement that exists touching the more general statements of the prophecy.

The reason for some difference of opinion here is: (1) the ten do not all arise at once; (2) few, if any of them, have always remained the same with the same name and exactly the same geographical boundaries; (3) there have not always been just ten, but sometimes less, and sometimes more than ten. As we study the various historical atlases, we find that there have been frequent and considerable changes which give the whole a sort of kaleidoscope aspect. Indeed it may not be an unreasonable view to say that except for a short time about 533, the prophecy contemplates uninterrupted and permanent division rather than mathematical exactness as to the number ten.

And this need not be a matter of surprise, nor does it in any way cast discredit upon the prophecy. True there is nothing in the prophecy of the 7th chapter of Daniel to prepare us for any change in the number or location of the kingdoms, but as in studying the 2nd chapter we instinctively, as it were, turn to the 7th chapter to determine the number of parts we should expect to find, so when the 7th chapter is reached in our study, we just as naturally turn back to the 2nd chapter to learn something as to the degree of stability of the several parts into which the kingdom is divided, and there we find something that fully prepares us for what we see in history, namely, the constantly varying picture presented by the maps of the different geographical divisions designed to assist the student who would, at different eras, identify as nearly as possible

the several kingdoms symbolized by the ten horns of the fourth beast of the 7th chapter. And what is it that thus prepares us to expect constant change among the kingdoms that were to arise in the Western Empire? It is this, recorded in Daniel 2:41-43:-

"Whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potters' clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay, And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay."

While as before noted there is in this scripture nothing to indicate the number of kingdoms, we are told not only that the kingdom would be divided, but that repeated and persistent effort would be made to reunite the several parts. This would necessarily mean many changes, not only in the personnel of rulers, but also in territorial boundaries, and probably also in names. That such efforts have been made, and that such changes have occurred is a matter of general knowledge. Those efforts resulting in many changes, have taken not only the form of matrimonial alliances indicated by the words, "they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men," but also the form of military conquests, and political combines, as in the case of the "Holy Roman Empire" which, however, as Voltaire, one of the most witty of Frenchmen, as well as one of the most astute of the men of his time, said was "neither holy nor Roman, nor an Empire."

It would require too much time to even name the many alliances, matrimonial and political, entered into for the purpose of reuniting,

if not all, at least several of the fragments of the Roman Empire. We must, however, mention Charlemagne, Otto the Great, Charles V, Napoleon I., and in our own day Wilhelm II., as conspicuous examples of rulers who have from time to time attempted, to outlive in various ways if not practically to rebuild the Empire of the Caesars. Perhaps Otto the Great met with the most seeming success, as the so-called "Holy Roman Empire" endured in name from 962 A.D. to 1806, when, forced to the step by the establishment of the Confederation of the Rhine, Francis II. of the House of Hapsburg resigned the imperial title.

We need not trouble ourselves to define the boundaries of the so-called "empire" founded by Otto. It was an attempt, but not a successful one to gather together again the fragments of the Roman Empire, and was never taken seriously by anybody but the Hapsburgs and the Pope.

Returning from this slight digression, we are confronted at the outset by several lists of the ten kingdoms. Perhaps we should give first the list that appears in "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation" as follows:-

The Huns, the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Franks, the Vandals, the Suevi, the Burgundians, the Heruli, the Anglo-Saxons, and the Lombards.--p. 132.

Dr. Albert Barnes gives this list drawn from Roman Catholic sources:-

1. The Ostrogoths in Moesia; 2. the Visigoths in Pannonia;
3. the Sueves and Alans in Gascoign and Spain; 4. the Vandals in Africa; 5. the Franks in France; 6. The Burgundians in Burgundy;
7. the Heruli and Turingi in Italy; 8. the Saxons and Angles in Britain; 9. the Huns in Hungary; 10. The Lombards at first upon the Danube, and afterwards in Italy.--"Notes on the Book of Daniel," p.322, (S. B. p. 554)

This Roman Catholic list is interesting chiefly as showing that they recognize the prophecy as applying to Western Rome and to the same era assigned to it by Protestants.

Elliott gives two lists, the first for the forty-seven years immediately preceding 533, as follows:-

Anglo-Saxons, Franks, Allemans, Burgundians, Visigoths, Suevi, Vandals, Heruli, Bavarians, Ostrogoths.

And then this list of kingdoms existing in 533:-

Anglo-Saxons, the Franks of central, Alleman-Franks of eastern, and Burgundic-Franks of southeastern France, the Visigoths, the Suevi, the Vandals, the Ostrogoths in Italy, the Bavarians, and the Lombards.

The only difference between Elliott's first list and his second is that whereas the first names the Heruli as one of the ten, that tribe is dropped from the second list and the Lombards appear in their stead, and this for the excellent reason that by this time (533 A.D.) the Heruli had ceased to exist in Rome as a distinct people and the Lombards had moved in and had become a recognized political entity in northern Italy.

In determining the original ten according to the prophecy, we must note carefully what the prophecy itself says. In Daniel 7:24, we have this explicit statement:-

"The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings."

From this text, understanding the word "after" in its normal and obvious meaning, it seems necessary to conclude that all the ten are in existence when the eleventh or little horn comes up. The question then is, when did the little horn arise or come up? From the standpoint of the prophecy, evidently when it obtained recognition

as a power having authority to enter upon the work attributed to it by the prophecy, namely, (1) to subdue either directly or through chosen agencies other powers to its will. (2) Speak great words against the Most High, by arrogating to itself power, authority and functions belonging only to the Most High. (3) Wearing out the saints, and (4) assuming to change the laws of the Most High.

It may be said that the Papacy existed in Paul's day, but evidently it was the evil principle of self-exaltation to which he referred in 1 Thess. 2:3-8, styling it "the mystery of iniquity," rather than the organic Papacy which later crystalized around the mischievous principle thus becoming the very embodiment or personification of that principle. This conclusion is indicated clearly enough by the reading of the scripture itself, and is borne out by the words of the angel to the prophet: "Another shall arise after them," that is, after the ten in point not of manner but of time. Therefore, we must find all the ten in existence before the appearance of the little, ^{or} Papal horn. Each of the ten must be in existence when the papal horn arises, which could not have been earlier than the first letter or decree of Justinian upon this subject, March 25, 533.

The eleventh or little horn must be a real, tangible, organic entity, not merely a principle. The word "another" necessarily denotes some form of government at least resembling a kingdom, and yet different from the others. It must be more than an abstraction. The principle, if such it be, must be crystalized, so that it appears just as definitely and clearly as do the ten that were to arise before it in point of time.

In his letter or decree of 533, preserved and handed down to

as in the Code of Justinian, Book 1, Title I, the emperor addresses the Pope as "head of all the churches." And that this may be more than an empty title the Emperor in effect pledges the imperial authority, saying, "We do not suffer anything which is mooted, however clear and unquestionable, pertaining to the state of the church, should fail to be made known to your Holiness, as being the head of all the churches. For, as we have said before, we are zealous for the increase of the honor and authority of your See in all respects." This was emphasized the same year by the addition of the statement that the Bishop of Rome was he by whom heretics were corrected. Thus the eleventh or little horn was to be diverse from those that were before it, and yet was to exercise real power. His dominion, though primarily spiritual, was to lay hold upon and to a greater or less extent to sway and to use political power even to the extent of imposing and inflicting penalties and waging war.

It may be objected that subsequent to this time Justinian himself greatly humiliated the Bishop of Rome by summoning him to Constantinople and by requiring him to practically acknowledge the patriarch of that city as his ecclesiastical equal. But Justinian could not undo what he had done. He could not change what he had written. A Vigilius might die practically in exile, but the papacy did not die. A royal decree had made not an individual but an office head over all the churches and corrector of heretics, and though an incumbent of that office might pass away the office itself remained, and still remains to this day.

From the words of the prophecy itself and from the testimony of history, the Papacy can not be assigned an earlier date than 533, and indeed we have until recently assigned it a date five years later, namely, 538. But if either of these dates is correct the Heruli

cannot be one of the ten, and consequently cannot be one of the three plucked up by the roots since as nearly as we can be determined by a study of the history of that people they ceased to be a power very early in the 6th century, certainly before 533.

Notwithstanding the fact that John Clark Ridpath states that the "first of the kingdoms established by the barbarians in Italy was that of the Heruli," it is more than questionable if the Heruli ever entered the Roman empire in any other capacity than as hired mercenaries, soldiers, or marauders. The seat of their kingdom was in and around the basin of the Elbe, well to the north of the northern confines of the Western Empire.

Perhaps in the past we have nearly all repeated glibly enough, at least in substance, the statement made in "Daniel and Revelation," namely, that "the three horns plucked up before it (the papal horn) were the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Vandals. And the reason why they were plucked up was because they were opposed to the arrogant claims of the papal hierarchy, and hence to the supremacy in the church of the bishop of Rome."

While not stated in so many words the necessary inference from the foregoing is that the Heruli, like the Vandals and Goths, were Arians, and therefore a party to the controversy between Arians and Catholics. The fact is that, as briefly stated by the Britannica, Art. "Heruli," "The Heruli remained heathen until the overthrow of their kingdom." Unlike the Vandals and Goths, the Papacy had nothing to do with their overthrow. They were completely overthrown in a purely political war with the Langobardi, or Lombards, seventy-five years before the latter became even nominally Catholic. Therefore, the Papacy or little horn, had neither interest nor part in the overthrow of the Heruli. Indeed, as the Papacy was not yet established

at that time, it was from the standpoint of prophecy non-existent when the Heruli were destroyed by the Lombards.

As before stated, the Heruli had their kingdom not in any part of the Roman empire but well to the North of it on the Elbe. Their first incursion into Rome seems to have been about 269 A.D., when they appeared temporarily about the mouth of the Rhine in what is now a part of Holland, but as late as the early part of the fifth century the Heruli still had their seat on the Elbe.

It is true that Odoacer, or Odivaker, is sometimes called the king of the Heruli, but he was not such in any proper sense of that title. He was not himself a Herulian, but probably descended from the Scyrrî. His following in Italy seems to have been composed of recruits from the Rugii, Scyrrî, Turcilingi, and Heruli, the latter probably only a small minority of the whole number. It seems impossible therefore, for this additional reason, that the Heruli could have been one of the ten kingdoms of the prophecy of Daniel seven.

That the Heruli never had a kingdom in Italy is further shown by the fact that today no man ^{can} definitely locate them in Italy apart from the motley throng of adventures and mercenaries that followed Odacer, - no one group of whom could be styled a kingdom to the exclusion of the others. Indeed as remarked by the "Britannica," 11th Edition, Vol. 15, p. 28, "The Herulian invaders had been but a band of adventurers; the Goths were an army; the Lombards, far more formidable, were a nation in movement." In fact the more this matter is examined in the light of modern research, the more evident it becomes that the Heruli never had any standing in Italy in any other capacity than that of barbarian warriors acknowledging no allegiance to any local leader except as he might either give or promise rewards in the shape of lands, loot, and license.

As before remarked, if the Herulian kingdom on the Elbe, the only kingdom that that people ever had, was not one of the ten, and no one claims that it was, it could not be one of the three. The question arises at once as to the three horns plucked up by the roots in the presence of the little horn. The answer is (1), The Vandals, destroyed by the armies of Justinian 533, 534. So complete was the overthrow of the Vandals that they at once ceased to exist as a nation, and today though there are many called "Vandals," because they act like them, there is in the world no people who trace their descent to that nation. (2) The Ostrogoths decisively defeated by the forces of Justinian before the city of Rome A.D. 538, and sixteen years later destroyed as a nation, some retiring "to their native seat beyond the mountains," far to the north, as remarked by Ridpath, while the scattered Goths, not either killed or expelled from the country, were absorbed by the native Italic population, so that the Ostrogoths too ceased to exist even as a strain of the Italians. (3) The Lombards, or Longobardi, who direct invaded that portion of the Roman Empire now known as Lower Austria, where they established themselves about 487 A.D. They remained in Lower Austria until the early part of the 6th century, when they were invited by Justinian to settle in Noricum and Banonia. (Southern Austria bordering on Italy.) They subsequently occupied that part of Italy now known as Lombardy.

Sometime prior to 508 A.D. the Lombards adopted Arianism, at least nominally, and a century later became Roman Catholic. In both instances however, they retained many of their former religious beliefs and practices. It seems to have been this fact that led to their final overthrow. As a nation the Lombards never became "good Catholics." And when their government ceased to be amenable to the Pope

it was overthrown in his interests, and at his suggestion and their territory was given to the Pope who thuse for the first time became a temporal prince; and here instead of in the so-called donation of Constantine we find the origin of the temporal power.

Perhaps a few words relative to the overthrow of the Lombards will be of interest in this connection, and it may be best drawn from a Catholic source, hence I quote from the Catholic Encyclopaedia, Vol. 9, page 338, Article Lombardy: "The Lombards at the time of the invasion (of the empire) were for the most part pagan; a few had imbibed Arianism, and hence their ferocity against priests and monks whom they put to death. They destroyed churches and monasteries; they hunted and killed many of the faithful who would not become pagans; they laid waste their property, and seized Catholic places of worship to hand them over to the Arians. The holy pontiff, Gregory the Great (540-604) does not cease to lament the desolation caused by the Longobard slaughter throughout Italy. Slowly however the light of faith made way among them and the Church won their respect and obedience. This meant protection for the conquered. Gradually the Church's constitution and customs spread among the barbarians the ideas of Roman civilization, until at last, in defence of her own liberty and that of the people which the Longobards continued to imperil, she was forced to call in the aid of the Franks (under Pippin), and thus change the fate of Italy. This occurred (756) only after two centuries of Longobardic domination."

Inasmuch as the prophecy describes the little horn as a power "before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots," it does seem that we should be able to show that the papacy was in some way directly concerned in the plucking up of the three horns that were to fall before it, or as we read in verse 24, A.R.V., were

"put down" by it.

As before shown, there is no evidence that the papacy was in any way concerned in the overthrow, or destruction of the Heruli. But it is beyond question that the Vandals, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards were all "put down", destroyed, or "plucked up" by the roots in response to demands of the Pope and thus directly in the interest of the Papacy, and by the Papacy, acting through its chosen agents and instruments. Of course the Heruli being eliminated as one of the three, it follows logically that they must be eliminated also as one of the ten. Indeed the Heruli lived and passed away before the Papacy became an established fact, and so before there was any point of contact established between them and the Papacy, and so before the era of the ten kingdoms of this prophecy.

To me it seems, as already stated, that the ten horns of the prophecy are the ten kingdoms that existed within the confines of the Roman Empire, when the Papacy emerging from its nonage entered upon its work of world domination, which was to last for 1,260 years.

As listed by Elliott, the ten "barbaric kingdoms formed by the invaders," existing within the limits of the Western Empire between the years 486 and 490, were, as we have seen, the Anglo-Saxons, the Franks, Allemanni, the Burgundians, the Visigoths, the Suevi, the Vandals, the Heruli, the Bavarians, and the Ostrogoths.

This was before the acts of Justinian constituting the bishop of Rome head of all the churches, and corrector of heretics. A few years later, namely in the beginning of 533, Elliott, as already noted, finds that some changes have taken place; the Heruli are gone and the Lombards have come in. The enumeration given by Elliott of the kingdoms existing in 533, is I am constrained to believe, the correct list of the ten kingdoms as contemplated in the prophecy, and

that among them must be found the three plucked up by the roots. One reason for so believing is that with the exception of the three thus plucked up the kingdoms named are the ones whose peoples can be identified today. The Heruli are gone. They like the Huns were invaders, raiders, and freebooters only. They founded nothing, they established nothing. Properly speaking they had no kingdom in Roman territory. The Vandals, the Ostrogoths and the Lombards completely lost their separate national existence, and the two first named were so absorbed as to be unidentified today, but the Lombards have given their name to a considerable district in Italy, while the other seven existing as political units in 533 can all be identified today, not all as independent states, but as distinct strains, and amidst all the changes and in spite of the efforts by mighty rulers to have it otherwise, the division foretold in the prophecy of Daniel 2, persists. Referring to this phase of the prophecy and its fulfillment, Rev. T. R. Birks aptly says: "A tenfold division, such as some have looked for, mathematical and unvaried, would frustrate one-half of the prediction; and would deprive the rest of its freedom and moral grandeur. But now every part is alike accomplished. At the same time, by these partial changes in the list of the doomed kingdoms, the reproach of a stern fatalism which would otherwise cloud the equity of divine Providence, is rolled away."

And here we might well dismiss the subject of the identity of the ten kingdoms, were it not for the reason that it affords such an excellent opportunity to make a plea for tolerance of opinion on this and other subjects not vital to our Adventist faith, nor necessarily destructive of good Christian experience. Why should one be considered a heretic, or be even suspected because he believes that the Alamyani and not the Huns should be reckoned as one of the ten? or that the

Lombards rather than the Heruli were one of the three, or for the reason that he holds and teaches that the ten horns of Rev. 13 and 17, are not the same as the ten horns of Daniel's fourth beast?

Not one of these is fundamental, not one of them is one of the pillars of our faith. Granting that it is desirable that there be in our literature, especially in our books a good degree of uniformity in these respects, are not Christian liberty and Christian charity still more to be desired?

I have not cited authorities so called, as the purpose of this discussion, I understand, is not to settle doctrine, but rather to suggest that there should be more independence of thought and more of a burden to know each man for himself, and as a result of his own study, the reasons for his faith. May the God of all truth guide us into the truth, and may we all come to see eye to eye, not from blindly following any human leader, but from following the leading of the divine Spirit in the study of the Scriptures, that divinely inspired book that is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Afternoon session

A. G. DANIELLS: The way is now open for any who wish to do so to ask Professor Prescott questions concerning the topic of the morning.

W. E. HOWELL: I would like to ask Professor Prescott if he is willing to enlarge just a little on the point of the "beginning" as he explained it this morning.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Taking the first chapter of John, the 3d verse: At a certain point where finite beings begin time, it does not mean that that is where the word began. When the scripture says, "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God," it does not mean that when you get back to that point that we denominate the beginning, then looking back into eternity, you can point to the time when the word was.

H. C. LACEY: Can we go one step further and say that the word was without beginning?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I was going to raise the question. Are we agreed in such a general statement as this, that the Son of God is co-eternal with the Father? Is that the view that is taught in our schools?

C. M. Sorenson: It is taught in the Bible.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Not to teach that is Arianism. Ought we to continue to circulate in a standard book a statement that the Son is not co-eternal, that the Son is not co-eval or co-eternal with the Father? That makes Him a finite being. Any being whose beginning we can fix is a finite being. We have been circulating for 40 years a standard book which says that the Son is not co-eternal

with the Father. That is teaching Arianism. Do we want to go on teaching that?

G. B. THOMPSON: "All things were created by him." Do you understand that to mean more than this earth?

W. W. PRESCOTT: Yes, whether they be thrones or principalities or powers or things visible or things invisible, all were created by him. That is, all existences of every kind depend upon His ~~the~~ pre-existence; and all present existences depend upon His present existence. Without Him there would be nothing in existence, and without Him that which is now in existence would fall out of existence.

C. P. BOLLMAN: Isn't that usually applied to His having existed before the incarnation?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I am using it as applying to His existence previous to the existence of anything else.

C. P. BOLLMAN: I would like to ask, Do you think it is necessary, or even helpful in the defining of Christian doctrine, to go outside of the New Testament for terms to use in the definition?

W. W. PRESCOTT: As to whether or not we shall accept dictionary terms?

C. P. BOLLMAN: No, I do not mean that.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Please illustrate what you mean.

C. P. BOLLMAN: The scripture says Christ is the only begotten of the Father. Why should we go farther than that and say that He was co-eternal with the Father? And also say that to teach otherwise is Arianism?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I do not find in the New Testament expressions

as "co-eternal," but I find expressions that are equivalent to that, as I understand it.

C. P. BOLLMAN: Give an example, please.

W. W. PRESCOTT: I think the expression "I am" is the equivalent of eternity. I think these expressions, while they do not use the term co-eternal, are equivalent in their meaning. That brings up the whole question of the relation of the Son to the Father. There is a proper sense, as I view it, according to which the Son is subordinate to the Father, but that subordination is not in the question of attributes or of His existence. It is simply in the fact of the derived existence, as we read in John 5:26: "For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself." Using terms as we use them, the Son is co-eternal with the Father. That does not prevent His being the only-begotten Son of God. We cannot go back into eternity and say where this eternity commenced, and where that eternity commenced. There is no contradiction to say that the Son is co-eternal with the Father, and yet the Son is the only-begotten of the Father.

C. P. BOLLMAN: I think we should hold to the Bible definitions.

W. W. PRESCOTT: We take the expression co-eternal, and that is better.

C. P. BOLLMAN: My conception of the matter is this; that at some point in eternity the Father separated a portion of Himself to be the Son. As far as the substance is concerned, He is just as eternal as the Father, but did not have an eternal separate existence. I do not think that approaches any nearer to Arianism than the other does to _____.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Suppose you say, There is the point where He had His beginning, and that back of that there was a time when the Father went forth in His Son. When you say a point, you conceive of it as a definite place and bring it into finite terms.

H. C. LACEY: May I say something on that point? Every year I am brought in touch with this from two points of view,--one in the Greek class, and the other in Bible Doctrines. Twice a year, and sometimes more frequently, I am brought face to face with this. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The same was in the beginning with God." The eternity of the Word is emphasized in that. When you come to the study of the deity of Christ, the fundamental attribute is eternity of existence. If Jesus is divine, He must have that essential attribute, and so I have dared to say that Christ is absolutely co-eternal with the Father. You can not say that back in some point of duration the Son appeared, and prior to that He had not appeared. I take it that God has no beginning. The Greek does not read, "In the beginning," but "In beginning,"--any beginning, every beginning. There is no article to it. It means that Christ antedated all beginning. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit antedated all beginning.

LACEY

I am just stating what I teach. I want to know whether this is so. That is what this council is for. I say that God was always in existence. Just as the light is always with the sun; the light comes from the sun, and so Jesus was always with God, always reigning with him. I have explained the meaning of the sun in this way. I son is always younger than his father. But if we bring into this divine conception the thought of motherhood and fatherhood as humanly understood, I think we are astray. It does not mean that Jesus had a mother, God is a Father. I am trying to explain what is meant by that expression that Michael in his ante-human existence was the son of God. I think those words are human words, used to express to us humanly speaking, the relation existing between the first and second person of the deity, and the priority of rank of the first person. The word is an expression of the relation of that second person to the first. He is as a son to the first. The Lord said of Israel, you are my first born. I will be a father to Israel, for the love that existed between them. To the first and only begotten son was a specially tender feeling, and to indicate the ~~marvellous~~ wondrous love of the first person of the Deity to the second, this expression is used. Never to indicate that the son came into existence after the father. Let us say this represents the six thousand years. Now back of this eternity, without end, God the Father spans that eternity.

I think we ought not to teach that there was a time when

He produced another being who is called the son. I want to know. The son is called eternal with the Father, another person living with him, a second intelligence in that Deity. The relationship between them is expressed by our human words father and son. The one was first in rank, the second, second, and the third third.

PRESCOTT

I think it well for us instead of attempting to reason out or to explain these things, to read a scripture. I think that will be a better plan than to spend a long time discussing themes, only that we may get the meaning of the scripture. Brother Lacey said eternity is an attribute of Deity. It is proof of the Deity. Now let us see how the scripture deals with it. Hebrews 1. The whole purpose of the chapter is to set forth the exalted character of the Son, and you will observe it is somewhat in harmony with what Brother Lacey has said. "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds.(R.V.) The article is not used. It is the relationship that is emphasized. The chapter is to tell us of the Son. Here we find that expression, "whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds." "Who being the effulgence of his glory," or the emanation of his glory, the raying forth of his glory, and the very image of his substance, in person. This word person

is one of the evidences of theological controversy that was attempted to be settled by translation. It is the idea of the fundamental. Going on: "Upholding all things by the word of his power." There we have the existence of all things being dependent upon him. Now it goes on in the fifth chapter, verse one, and proves that he is above angels. "Thou art my son. I will be to him a father." Eighth verse: "But of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." In the tenth verse: "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning didst lay the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou continuest," -- a much better word than "remainest." Him it was that continues. That is an eternal presence, simply, "Thou continuest." That is the attribute of his being as God. He is called God here in this very chapter. As a sort of evidence of the scriptural teaching that he is God, here is this expression, Thou continuest, without regard to beginning or end. In the thirteenth chapter of the same epistle: "He is the same yesterday, today, and forever." When did yesterday commence? Simply yesterday, that's all. "Jesus Christ, the same, yesterday, today, and forever." I think that is parallel with the 90th Psalm: "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. . . . From everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. I think those statements apply to the same being. The same is true in the Book of Deuteronomy the 33rd chapter.

Deut. 33:26: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heavens in thy help, and in his excellency on the eky. The eternal God is thy dwelling place and underneath are the everlasting arms." There is no revelation of God except in the Son, and ^{where} here it says that the eternal God is thy dwelling place, it must be the Son. Underneath are the everlasting arms. The only support that we receive is from Christ, and in Christ. The only knowledge we have of God is through the Son, and the only relationship we have to God is through the Son. Every revelation of him of every sort whatsoever is through the Son.

C.P.BOLLMEN: Do you think that all those expressions there refer not to the Father but to the Son?

W. W. PRESCOTT: They refer to both, but the only revelation of him we have is in the Son, and therefore the Son must be with the Father, co-eternal, and the same expression applies. The Jehovah. Take the word Jehovah. The Jehovah of the Old Testament is manifested in Jesus in the New Testament. It shows in the word itself, as well as in the general teaching. Jehovah -- Jesus in Joshua, are the same. Joshua is simply the contraction for Jehovah. (A number of root words mentioned) Jehovah manifested for salvation is Jesus, and the Jesus of the New Testament is manifestly a manifestation of the Jehovah of the Old Testament.

J. Anderson: Did you state that he derived life from the Father?

W. W. Prescott: No. Simply in the fact that equality with the Father is derived equality, but equality is the same.

J. Anderson: I thought you said that he derived life from the Father.

W. W. Prescott: No. I used the Scripture statement -- John 5:36: "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." But the two expressions referred to must apply equally both to the Father and the Son.

Question: Simply a difference in what respect -- that of rank with the Father?

W. W. Prescott: He himself says that "the Father is greater than I. He also said "I and my Father are one." And both are true.

(J. Anderson)

Question: If he is inferior in any respect to the Father how can he be God?

W. W. Prescott: I do not think that I used that ~~expression~~ term "inferior."

J. Anderson: But others may use that word in some instances -- that the Son was inferior to the Father, and my inquiry arises that if it were true that Jesus the Son was inferior in any respect -- in age, or in nature, or attributes; if that be so, how could he be God?

W. W. Prescott: I would not say that he was. I do not think I used that expression.

H.C.Lacy: Is it not that he is only inferior to the Father in rank -- he is second in rank with the Father, and in all other respects is equal?

W. W. Prescott: We must, of course, in our dealing with the question, take his own statement both ways. When he said, "The Father is greater than I," we deal with that, and when he said, "I and the Father are one," we deal with that. We must have a conception of each one that will allow his own statement, what he himself says, to be true.

Question: As to Christ's preexistence, and the fact that he "emptied" himself.

W. W. Prescott: He was still divine.

Question: The question which comes to my mind is, How could Jesus being God, still be inferior to God?

W. W. Prescott: Yes, I think we must take that into account. I would not use the word contradictory to any expression of the Scripture. That shuts our minds to any understanding. Take the two statements referred to: "I and my Father are one," therefore they took up stones to stone him. What were they going to stone him for? "Because thou being man makest thyself God." He also said, "The Father is greater than I." Now to say these are contradictory shuts up the mind to correct comprehension of the truth. We must not say that. We must not use such expressions. We must not ask, How do you reconcile these two? I do not like to hear that expression, because it implies something that needs explanation or is contradictory. The contradiction is not in the word. The only difficulty is in the ability of the finite mind to comprehend all of God. And we shall always face difficulty. But I try to stay as closely as possible to the Scripture statements, and be careful in the use of words, and I do not try

to apply to reasoning power that will enable me to explain any Biblical terms. That will be impossible. Rather, as the question rose, as we ~~raised~~ referred to it this morning, we will get light, not by questioning, but by saying it is so first, then waiting for more. That is the only way we can get it. We know it is true. We know it is so. We know that what the Scripture says is so; there is no contradiction; and not wait till we see further light in ~~it~~ regard to it. But if we start with the thought that this is contradictory, the Spirit cannot bring light to bear upon it.

H.C.Lacey: Is not the thought, second in rank, preferable to the term "inferior"?

W. E. Prescott: One with the Father, one in authority, in power, in love, in mercy, and all the attributes -- equal with him and yet second in nature. I like the word "second" better than "inferior," -- second in rank.

C.P.BOLLMAN: Subject to the Father -- is not that the meaning of the word?

H. W. PRESCOTT: We might ~~also~~ speak of many things beyond our comprehension.

~~34~~ ~~th~~
34
(Paper read by Eld M. C. Wilcox at morning session was completed at this meeting.)

D i s c u s s i o n on M.C. Wilcox's
t opic.

PRESCOTT:

Would Brother Wilcox be willing on the last point (Par. 22) to state what relation exists between our own view of interpreting scripture and what should be given to what others have taught or written, when we come to the study of Scripture.

WILCOX: I would state, so far as my own personal experience is concerned, I have not accepted of any view easily. I was an infidel when this message reached me and did not believe anybody's view of things scriptural. Consequently it was hard for me to embrace the truth--it was hard at that time. But when I gave myself to God I made up my mind I would follow any way he led, and I have taken the statement of others who had gone before. I did not have the time to investigate when I heard the message. But I have found real satisfaction in later years as I have studied the Word for myself to find that my view coincided with theirs--that the view I had accepted was in harmony with the Word of God. I can say so far as I know myself I have never departed or tried to depart find one single new thing--that was contrary to the great message and movement with which I am connected; but what did come to me came because it seemed the only logical outcome there was from the Scripture itself. I would like to say again I have never found anything yet that I studied earnestly and sought

God earnestly, and followed all the light I could get in every way--still holding to the Word, as the early men of the message did--that had taken me away from the message in any way or made me to look upon it with any less degree of devotion. In fact it has endeared it to me more and more, and I have seen more and more in it and the men connected with the movement, that has increased my confidence in the message and in its triumph.

(35-36)

F M Wilcox

How much shall we have regard for the historical development of truth, or its historical development in connection with the movement with which it is associated. You take it in the Psalms, and David repeatedly cites Israel to the leadings of God as an evidence, calls upon them to remember the way God has led them. It seems to me that we should remember that in the development of truth, the certainty of truth, the certainty of doctrines, just the same as in a material leading of God. I believe these principles that have been set forth in this paper are excellent. I believe that every man who has studied the scriptures of truth should seek to be led by the Spirit of God, but it seems to me that he must have in that study due appreciation for the study of his brethren, for their conclusions as well as his own, and for the historic development of truth in connection with the church of God, with the movement with which he is connected.

M CWILCOX

I think of one of the statements Elder Daniells read last night, found also in the chapter on the Danger of Rejecting Light in Gospel Workers, and also in manuscripts which different ones possess, that we should subject everything that we hold to the closest and most faithful scrutiny. I believe that. At the same time I believe that we ought to have regard for the leading of God in the message. I believe that also. I feel just as confident as can be that God has led all the way. But we all ought

to remember that while the Psalmist tells us that is true, yet in other places he shows that there was an imperfect people all the way, and we should not idolize the human agents that God uses.

LL Caviness

I appreciate very much this outlining of the principles of Bible interpretation. It seems to me very complete. But there is one that seems to me is often violated, that was not included. That is the law of the context. It seems to me it is very common to take a portion of scripture and apply it absolutely without any reference to the context with which it occurs. I find myself that I have to fight against that. It is so easy to take something in the Bible or the Spirit of Prophecy and apply it as being a principle of truth for the present time, when maybe it has an application for the present time, but it had a stronger application at some other time. I think that is one of the principles we ought to keep in mind, to think about the context in the study that we make, in order to get a right setting for the great truths God is making plain to us.

H C LACEY

It has seemed to me there is another, "The law of ancient Eastern usage." We must never forget that while the Bible is up to date, yet it was written in the East, and that expressions are used from the Eastern point of view that we must know not only the meaning of, but the manner in which they used it. The law of ancient Eastern usage does come in here in the understanding and interpretation of scripture.

a

39

7/2

G B THOMPSON

The Bible does not give any syllabus of principles on interpretation. How are we to know that our principles of interpretation are correct?

M C WILCOX

I thought that these had been tested in all the other prophecies. They have been in use all through the Message, and been tested out. The Bible does not give us any straightforward doctrines.

W W PRESCOTT

I would like to ask, according to the law of first mention, what is the meaning of a horn in the symbol of prophecy.

M C WILCOX

I do not know that I could give it off hand. I haven't thought of that in that particular light.

F M WILCOX

Give one of your own

M C WILCOX

It is not always used for the same thing. It is primarily used, to my mind, for exaltation, honor, power. "Thy horn is greatly exalted." From that derivation come the other meanings that stand for the very thing of power itself, kingdom, etc.

W W PRESCOTT

I was coming to a very specific thing. In Daniel the ten horns are ten kingdoms that shall arise. In Revelation the two horns are republicanism and protestantism. How shall we explain that according to the law of prophetic interpretation?

M C WILCOX

It seems to me that the very limitations given to those two horns give us a different view from the ten horns of the beast. He had two horns like a lamb. The Lamb is the symbol of Christ. The lamb that had seven horns. Perfection here is the great first quality. Two of those can be used to apply to civil power, and only two of the great principles of Christ's government can, and they are equality of man and the right to believe or refusal to believe -- religious liberty and equality. It seems to me the definition there, Two horns like a lamb, shows that it is different from the horns of the beast. He didn't have two horns like a beast, but like a lamb. Those two principles are found in Christianity alone of all religions, and in the United States Government of all governments.

J N ANDERSON

Speaking of the matter of double fulfillment of prophecy, how may we know there may not be three?

M C WILCOX

There might be three

J N ANDERSON

Or four?

M C WILCOX

Or four.

J N ANDERSON

There must be a limit somewhere or else we would be led astray. I question the double interpretation. My study has led me to believe that there can be only one fulfillment, but several

applications. That one prophecy may illustrate other things, but the prophecy looks to one event and one event only is fulfilled.

M C WILCOX

Did not John the Baptist fulfill the type of Elijah?

J N ANDERSON

I agree in the matter of a type, but that is different from a fulfillment. Where one event becomes an illustration of another, there may be more than one application, but when you speak of one statement that is fulfilled entirely, to me that is very different, and I should feel some difficulty in following the Scriptures in that way.

W W PRESCOTT

Was the prophecy of Isaiah to Ahaz in the seventh of Isaiah fulfilled to Ahaz? No. Was it not fulfilled to Christ?

J N ANDERSON

My understanding to that would be that it was an illustration.

W W PRESCOTT

Then you will have to change the wording.

J N ANDERSON

I think the tenor of his writing would explain it that way.

W W PRESCOTT

How about Matt. 15:7, 8: "Well did Esaias prophecy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me."? Was not that fulfilled in Isaiah's time?

J N ANDERSON: The same truth is applied here, but the event itself was fulfilled in Isaiah's time.

W W PRESCOTT: How do you deal with the scriptures when they use the word fulfilled? Could you take it as it is?

J N ANDERSON: I think it means an application and not a fulfillment in that specific sense. That is my conception of it. The same truth is illustrated in both cases.

M C WILCOX: Do you not think there is such a thing as a partial fulfillment to Israel, and then a plenary fulfillment?

J N ANDERSON: I would say that it may be if the wording of the prophecy would warrant that.

M C WILCOX: The words are quoted in Matthew three and Luke three from Isaiah, and also in John 1:19. John quotes the very prophecy of Isaiah and applies it himself. He could not have fulfilled the whole of that.

J N ANDERSON: It may have been so large that he could not fulfill the whole. I feel a difficulty if we say it can be twice, it seems to me we have no check, and where shall we end? If we let down the bars with that sort of interpretation, why should we defend ourselves when the other man wants to take us still farther?

M C WILCOX: That is true of the great facts. ~~I do not~~ think It seems to me that the very giving of the prophecy and the plan of the prophecy itself, convey the correct idea. Take Isaiah 40. "The voice of one crying in the wilderness. That was fulfilled at the first advent of our Lord. You may make the prophecy broad and say it was fulfilled in Messianic times, but

you certainly find a partial fulfillment of that in John the Baptist, as stated in Matthew 3 and Luke 3. We know that the fulfillment of that application comes now just before his second advent, because the very terms of the original prophecy embraced both. I have never found any difficulty myself, not have I ever found any difficulty in convincing the outside people to whom I have talked. It seems to me clear that there can be the partial fulfillment in local conditions of the times of the prophet or a little later even, and the plenary fulfillment when He comes.

61st God
Take the 69th of Isaiah: "The spirit of the Lord is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." He stopped there and closed the book and said, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." And yet we know that the very next clause, "and the day of vengeance of our God," is preached now for this time.

A O TAIT: I think that principle only applies to a certain class of prophecies, and that there are prophecies that can have only one definite fulfillment, and I think there would be no difficulty on that point. I think the point that Brother Anderson makes there is a good one, that there are certain prophecies that have a definite fulfillment, and only one, and that ends it.

W W PRESCOTT: Aren't we safe in using the scriptures themselves when they all maintain one fulfillment as a fulfillment?

A O TAIT: I was thinking in that connection of that prophecy in the second of Acts where Peter says: "This is that which was spoken of the prophet Joel." But it was only a part of the prophecy of Joel which was fulfilled then. The rest of it comes on later.

A. G. DANIELLS: If it has not a double fulfillment, then one fulfillment covers the entire Christian dispensation from Pentecost to the latter end.

E. R. PALMER: I understood that in presenting the matter, Brother Wilcox, with regard to the double fulfillment of prophecy, you limited it to Old Testament prophecy. Was that your intention?

M. C. WILCOX: Yes, that was it,--largely to the Israel of old.

F. W. FIELD: I will ask Brother Wilcox why he did not include the prophecy in Matthew 24 as an example of a prophecy with a double application. Sister White makes that very plain that in this prophecy the Saviour did mingle events with reference to the troubles that were coming upon Jerusalem, closing with the siege and destruction of the city, and events in connection with the persecution that followed.

M. C. WILCOX: That would be, of course, a prophecy to Israel of old.

J. N. ANDERSON: I had one little thought in my mind in regard to pentecost. Now it seems to me that that cannot be fulfilled a second time. I understand (I would like to be corrected if I am mistaken) that the Lord promised to send the Holy Spirit as a third person, coming ten days after the ascension of our Lord. And I understand that person has been in the world ever since that time. Now, that person can never be sent from heaven again, for He has never been withdrawn from the world, so that pentecost can never be fulfilled again. We cannot say that half of the Holy Spirit came then, and the other half will come later, because the third person was sent then, and has been here ever since.

M. C. WILCOX: That was the question that Brother Tait raised.

BPF

48-50

7-2-19

Of course we all agree on the question of the double outpouring, the early and the latter rain.

W. W. PRESCOTT: I think there are some features that should be considered. I would like to have a broader consideration of this question.

A. G. DANIELLS: We can divide the time tomorrow morning on the study of this question, and it seems to me it is worthy of it. I hope the Bible teachers will be ready, and let us make the hour very valuable. We will now have the discussion of Brother Bollman's paper presented this morning.

C. P. BOLLMAN: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as there were quite a number of questions asked during the reading this morning, I ought to be allowed to finish reading my paper. There are only a few pages.

(There being no objection, Elder Bollman finished his paper.)

A. G. DANIELLS: Now, Brother Bollman, just state in a word or two what is your list of the ten kingdoms that meet the prophecy of Daniel 7.

C.P.BOLLMAN: Read the following, spoken of as "the second list." The Anglo Saxons, the Franks, the Alamanni, Franks, or what we usually term the Alamanni, the Burgundian Franks, or what we usually term the Burgundians, the Visigoths, the Suevi, the Vandals, the Ostrogoths, the Bavarians, and the Lombards.

QUESTION: Do the Bavarians take the place of the Heruli? (No answer given)

QUESTION: Which of the three were uprooted?

ANSWER: The Vandals, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards.

QUESTION (G.B.THOMPSON): What former kingdom does this Bavarian kingdom take the place of in the regular list today?

C.P.BOLLMAN: That just depends on how you think of it in your mind. I should say it took the place of the Huns. But really it does not take the place of anything, because they have all changed.

VOICE: I suppose that it would take the place of the Huns years ago.

QUESTION: Did not the Alamanni take the place of the Huns years ago?

ANSWER: Yes, that is so.

C.P.BOLLMAN: You can say that I take up this book and put that book down. But suppose there are a whole lot of books laying around, and there was a different arrangement of the books, then it would be hard to tell what

book takes the place of another book. So it is hard to tell just what people take the place of other people. So we have several lists arranged. You say the lists are not identical. What particular country takes the place of some other country, I do not know.

VOICE: The query was on the list and not the territory.

QUESTION: What year was that list made up?

ANSWER: 533. This first list was made in 531, and he finds a change had taken place and he drops out the Heruli and puts in the Lombards.

A.O.TAIT: This list that you have given is the same as the one we have been using the last twenty years, aside from the Bavarians. You put the Bavarians in the place of the Heruli. The Heruli is the only one you have thrown out of the list that we have been using for the last twenty years, and you put the Bavarians in place of it.

C. P. BOLLMAN: In a sense the Bavarians take the place of the Heruli.

A.O.TAIT: I think that is the sense in which I asked the question.

C. P. BOLLMAN: It is a geographical proposition, and as the change has taken place between Elliott's first list and the second list, right in there; and in that sense these Lombards would take the place of the Heruli.

VOICE: I can see more reason for throwing the Heruli out than for putting in the Bavarians.

PROF. HOWELL: That is just what I would like to know -- the reason for putting in the Bavarians.

A map was then produced and Elder Daniells pointed out the location of the various kingdoms as found today.

ELDER DANIELLS: I suppose Bavaria was about where it is now as placed on the map. This really gives two of these countries to the Germans -- the Alamanni to the Germans and the Bavarians. So it makes two of these horns out of one class of people, it seems to me.

ELDER DANIELLS: May I now ask that the Bible and history teachers give us a statement of just what you are teaching in the schools.

PROF. SORENSON: I believe, brethren, that we have a real important paper before us this afternoon and this morning. Sometimes we may think these things do not matter much, that they are not essential to salvation. But they are vital. The interpretation of prophecy is essential to salvation in these last days. But there is a crusade of opposition against it, and an under-current among Seventh-day Adventists exists to put it away, and an attempt is made to wipe off the slate the entire program since the days of the apostles down to this present time. The hope of the Lord's soon coming, the hope we have stood for because of the prophecies, is the one thing the enemy is making great onslaughts against today, and when we can come to concrete views of this question, and when we can come to an understanding, we shall have reached the one thing

of importance in these last days. God has a great continuous message. Every part has its bearing on some other point. I have been very much gratified as I have heard these papers today. These subjects have all been vital. Each links into some other prophecy, and when one moves we move the whole system.

The thing that impresses me in Elder Hollman's paper is that first foundation principle he lays down, that it is not a mathematical division of these ten kingdoms -- they mingle themselves and then get apart again; they strive with each other, they black each other up; and yet they meet the specifications of the prophecy. While God has determined how many there shall be, yet in the determination of God there is recognition of the right that men will exert themselves. We all believe in sovereign rights and human freedom. That applies to prophecy as well as to anything else. That is one of the finest things I ever got hold of. I might mention that as a denomination the question will be raised by people today, and by young people, of criticising the solid foundation of this whole question. We as teachers meet young people who are not afraid to say what they think, and we have to meet this question. Our friend, A. T. Jones, helped to create this sentiment, perhaps not so much at the time when he was in the church as since he has been out of the church, but he drew logical formulas that were not true. They were tremendously logical, but were not true, and that is why they were accepted by some people temporarily. We have had notions, and have had a fatalistic sentiment concerning a thing that is not in harmony with the words of Scripture themselves.

That one idea alone in Elder Bollman's paper is a wonderful point to get hold of. I find young people who want facts, who think for themselves, and who are not afraid to talk back to the teacher; and we find this fatalistic sentiment has crept in, and we must meet it.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Asks question about meaning of "fatalistic sentiment" — next reporter supposed to take.

PRESCOTT: Just what do you mean by fatalistic setting of prophecy?

SORENSEN: I mean that these kingdoms "had to come." When God speaks the things he has spoken will come to pass. But in the prophecy of the Second Chapter of Daniel this is not always so. This number of kings varies. Sometimes there nine ten, twelve, eight, and even five. Charlemagne reduced it to one. There is no specified number.

WILCOX: Is not this the plan that there was one time when there were just ten kingdoms?

SORENSEN: Yes, but there are two times the ten kingdoms are mentioned(?) Here is a copy of one of the most recent and most reliable maps (turning to map) Here we have the ten divisions as referred to by Elder Bollman in 533. We have a definite ten, but there is still ten: The Anglo Saxons, Franks, Allemanni (the Bavarians are not definitely segregated yet) Odoacer king of the Burgundians, Visigoths, the Vandals, Suevi and East Goths, and then there is a section occupied by the Siagri.

PRESCOTT: What kingdom is Odoacer?

SORENSEN: I call it as it is named on the map. It is an aggregation of tribes occupying this section of the Roman empire. You must remember that these ten tribes were a good deal like our American Indians when the white people first came over. They had no cities, no commerce or private ownership in land, and therefore they could pick up and move from place to place. They had no distinct nationality.

schull
VOICE: Why not call it the Heruli, as it is mentioned in history?

SORENSEN;

Some histories do and some do not.

Here is this other map Elder Bollman referred to, in the year 533. It gives ten kingdoms.

PRESCOTT: Do you teach that to your classes?

SORENSEN: I do not directly, but in dealing with this subject I include the idea that there is a change; and yet there is a t specified times ten kingdoms existing. and I am not prepared to reject the Heruli as one of the kingdoms.

BOLLMAN: They were not a kingdom at the time of the Papacy.

SORENSEN: I use two lists in my teaching to show the ten kingdoms at different times. In this later list the Heruli have gone off and the Bavarians have taken their places.

M. C. WILCOX: There was a time when there were ten kingdoms, and right at that time there came up another--the little horn--Is that the fatalistic idea?

SORENSEN: I do not think so. But there is a point in Elder Bollman's paper I would like to ask him about: We say the Sabbath was changed by the Papacy. Now the Sabbath was changed before 533. So far as any change was ever made--And can we break that law until we bring the Papacy into the prophecy of Daniel? Is there any necessity of waiting until 533 before bringing the Papacy in?

PRESCOTT: (to Sorenson) Are we to distinguish in this question between the Catholic Church and the Papacy?

WASHBURN: The little horn became a monarchical power at the time Justinian constituted the Bishop of Rome a monarch.

PRESCOTT: Could you make a distinction that we had the Catholic Church which changed the Sabbath before we had the Papacy?

WASBURN: Yes

WILCOX: I would call it a dominating power of the Papacy.

PRESCOTT: It leads us on to further ~~pragmatics~~ distinguish between the papacy as a monarchical power and the Catholic Church.

WILCOX: We may distinguish that the Little Horn is not the Roman Catholic Church.

SORENSEN: (Pointing out the list on the map) Anglo Saxons, Franks, Allemanni, Kingdom of Seragrus (south of the Franks)

VOICE: What do you mean by the kingdom of Seragrus?

SORENSEN: It is that kingdom ruled by this man Seragrus who governed this territory.

WIRTH: Is not that a part of the Roman Empire?

SORENSEN: ~~any~~ Is there any ground in prophecy to show that these kingdoms must necessarily be governed by barbarian rulers. The prophecy does not say the empire was overrun with barbarians, but it does say the great Imperial unity was to be broken up into ten parts.

(Continuing reading the list): --Visigoths, Suevi, Vandals, Odoacer, East Goths. Thus in 476 was the Western empire extinguished. In 526 we have the list Elder Bollman refers to, which is still ten. It is the same territory: (Reading) Anglo Saxons, Franks, Allemanni, Burgundians, Suevi, Visigoths, Vandals, East Goths, Bavarians, Lombards. In the Middle Ages we come quite often across about ten kingdoms.

PALMER: Might I ask Brother Sorenson whether in his teaching he would emphasize the persistency of the division of the Roman Empire according to the prophecy or whether he would emphasize the continuance of a definite ten.

107

SORENSEN: When the Western Empire was broken up there were ten. When Justinian gave the Bishop of Rome power there were ten. There were two different times in history when there were ten. In my teaching I do not emphasize, simply referring the class to this fact.

WIRTH: I understand that really there are two positions. If we look at the Roman Empire in 475, it may include the Heruli, because Odoacer was at the head of world affairs there in 476. Then the Heruli would be one of the ten kingdoms.

While Elder Bollman says the Heruli passed off the stage of action in 533, and we must eliminate them, and therefore brings in the Bavarians. Is that right?

BOLLMAN: I think that is so.

WILCOX: Does not the very prophecy itself forbid the insistence upon a definite continuance of the ten kingdoms. If three are plucked up the prophecy does not insist that there were ten.

DANIELLS: Would Brother Prenter like to speak his opinion?

PRENTER: I have been teaching the last twenty years the same list, and I feel to continue after what I have heard this morning. The Heruli were made up of four tribes. As long as we have been using the word "Heruli" it seems to me it would bring less confusion to the students if we were to go on using it.

107

PALMER: Might I ask Brother Sorenson whether in his teaching he would emphasize the persistency of the division of the Roman Empire according to the prophecy or whether he would emphasize the continuance of a definite ten.

107

SORENSEN: When the Western Empire was broken up there were ten. When Justinian gave the Bishop of Rome power there were ten. There were two different times in history when there were ten. In my teaching I do not emphasize, simply referring the class to this fact.

WIRTH: I understand that really there are two positions. If we look at the Roman Empire in 475, it may include the Heruli, because Odoacer was at the head of world affairs there in 476. Then the Heruli would be one of the ten kingdoms.

While Elder Bollman says the Heruli passed off the stage of action in 533, and we must eliminate them, and therefore brings in the Bavarians. Is that right?

BOLLMAN: I think that is so.

WILCOX: Does not the very prophecy itself forbid the insistence upon a definite continuance of the ten kingdoms. If three are plucked up the prophecy does not insist that there were ten.

DANIELLS: Would Brother Premier like to speak his opinion?

PREMIER: I have been teaching the last twenty years the same list, and I feel to continue after what I have heard this morning. The Heruli were made up of four tribes. As long as we have been using the word "Heruli" it seems to me it would bring less confusion to the students if we were to go on using it.

107

DANIELLS: There were ten, and the Heruli were on the stage of action, but the reason you say they ~~dropped~~ out is because they were not among the ten dropped out before the Papacy was legally established. But when the Empire was broken up and divided, even before the time the little horn came up, the Heruli did constitute a part of the division.

BOLLMAN: The point is this. That there comes up another little horn before the others or among the others, and there are ten. We must find ten in existence when the little horn comes up. I do not see how we can place the little horn earlier than 537 (?)

WIRTH: I think that Professor Caviness gave a good thought from the Hebrew regarding that expression "came up before the little horn," that according to the Hebrew it ~~means~~ ~~means~~ means "came up in the presence of the little horn,"—that is, that these three were plucked up and were not to be before the Papacy in time but "in the presence of" the Papacy.

PRESCOTT: The little horn as a power changes the law. Now if we say the Sabbath was changed by the Laodicean Council ~~saxsxfinalxaptinam~~ in the fourth century, and the little horn power did not appear until 533, where are we on the change of the law?

VOICE: Was there any papacy before 533?

PRESCOTT: It was a horn power. Not earlier than 533. But where the papacy changes the law. Now we say the Sabbath was changed as a climax in the Laodicean Council, but that could not be later than the fifth century.

DANIELLS: There were ten, and the Haruli were on the stage of action, but the reason you say they ~~dropped~~ were not among the ten dropped out before the Papacy was legally established. But when the Empire was broken up and divided, even before the time the little horn came up, the Haruli did constitute a part of the division.

BOLLMAN: The point is this: That there comes up another little horn before the others or among the others, and there are ten. We must find ten in existence when the little horn comes up. I do not see how we can place the little horn earlier than 537 (?)

FIRTH: I think that Professor Caviness gave a good thought from the Hebrew regarding that expression "came up before the little horn," that according to the Hebrew it ~~means~~ ~~means~~ means "came up in the presence of the little horn,"—that is, that these three were plucked up and were not to be before the Papacy in time but "in the presence of" the Papacy.

PRESCOTT: The little horn as a power changes the law. Now if we say the Sabbath was changed by the Laodicean Council ~~xxxxxx~~ in the fourth century, and the little horn power did not appear until 533, where are we on the change of the law?

VOICE: Was there any papacy before 533?

PRESCOTT: It was a horn power. Not earlier than 533. But where the papacy changes the law. Now we say the Sabbath was changed as a climax in the Laodicean Council, but that could not be later than the fifth century.