

W W PRESCOTT

The greatest fact in the world is Christianity. Our ability to deal with this great fact is measured by our ability to deal with things invisible with that same reality that we deal with visible things. And until we are trained to that, we shall not be able to apprehend this greatest fact in the world. The center of this greatest fact is the greatest person. That person is Christ. The whole problem of Christianity is that the Christ of history shall become the Christ of experience. That is the whole problem of Christianity. If he is to us simply the Christ of history, as a person outside of ourselves and apart from ourselves, he has only that influence upon the life that any ideal will have. But ideals are not sufficient. No one can be saved from himself by an ideal. That ideal must become a personality in him, in order to change his life. Now our great difficulty, as I have come to apprehend it, is the separation of the Christ of history from the Christ of experience, so that he is an ideal to us, and an example, a pattern, and not an indwelling life. That is the whole question of Christianity.

Now I certainly hope with Elder Daniells that our study of these things shall not be merely intellectual. There is no study in the world equal to this study simply from the intellectual standpoint. When one faces these wonderful mysteries and attempts to grasp them with the human mind, when one faces this book and attempts to grasp the theme, for I say the theme of this book, and to recognize that theme from Genesis to Revelation, to

recognize the working of a purpose, a divine mind, in all the history that is covered from creation until now, if there is anything that will put the human mind upon the stretch, it is not that. We have been attempting to grapple with it in that way. We have done only piecemeal in little sections. I hope we shall gain an appetite, a consuming appetite, to be able to deal with this book as a whole, to grasp what is really revealed here, not simply to grasp diverse propositions, diverse manners, but to grasp in that whole in which there was revealed to us the person of his son.

I would like to have you read some scriptures for me. (Elder Prescott then gave out various texts of scripture, and after they had been read, he commented on them one by one as follows:)

Matt. 11:28: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

Here is a man among men, talking to men, but he says, "Come unto me."

Matt. 11:29: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls"

"Come to me," "Learn of me." The one title which is applied to Christ more than any other, more than any other in the gospels, is Teacher. It is perhaps lost sight of in our Authorized Version, where it is Master. It is the same word. The Revised Version puts it Teacher. "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." I think we more often think of Christ in his power, in his miracles,

in his wonderful works, than in his meekness. When he said "Learn of me," he did not say, Learn of me by watching my miracles, but "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart. I think that is the very foundation of all our learning of him, that meekness and lowliness that surrenders to him, that does not pretend to know anything only as it is taught of him.

John 14:1: "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in me."

"Come unto me," "Learn of me," "Believe in me."

Mark 10:21: "Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me."

Here is another one. Come to me, learn of me, believe in me, -- we must not forget that this was a man talking to men, using the same language that they used, subject to the same limitations that they were, and yet he says, Believe in me, Follow me.

John 15:4: "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me."

Who is a Christian? One who believes the creed? One who joins the church? He may believe the creed, and he may join the church, but who is a Christian? A Christian is one who comes to Christ, who learns of Christ, who believes in Christ, who follows Christ, who abides in Christ. That is a Christian (Amen). It is not to be settled by definitions of doctrine, by relationship

by some organization, the whole thing is settled by the personal relation to that person (Amen) I want these scriptures to speak to us for what they really are.

Eph. 1:7: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace."

What more can we ask for? We do not have redemption by assenting to a doctrine. We don't have redemption by doing certain things, our redemption is in him.

Rom. 3:24: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."

Just the same as in Eph. 7. Through the redemption that is in him, and there is no redemption apart from him. "In whom we have our redemption." The redemption is in him. When we receive him we receive the redemption, and we cannot have the redemption without receiving him.

Acts 16:30, 31: "And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house."

Do we need to add anything to that to make it complete? Doesn't a man have to repent? Doesn't a man have to bring forth the fruits of righteousness, to have a variety of experiences? Certainly. And yet all that must be bound up in that experience of believing on him, or else Paul never could have said that to the jailer. What is our duty as students of the Word? It is our duty to see how it is bound up in that expression. It is all comprehended in that statement, parallel with John 3:16, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that who-

soever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Again we see the use of the word Son rather than Jesus or Christ. "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. That is the whole gospel. It is our duty to see that those are the tests to the whole book. They as it were involve the whole book. It takes the whole book to explain John 3:16. It takes the whole book to explain the verses in Acts 16. What Paul said to the jailer must have been intelligible to him, for he accepted Christ and was baptized that very night. It must not have been a mere comprehensive theory of the proposition. That man was a heathen. It may be that Paul went on and explained to him, very likely he did, but it was all bound up in that one statement, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

Eph. 3:8-11: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold ~~riches~~ wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Notice three things especially in that scripture: 1. The unsearchable riches of Christ. When he proclaimed that, he had been expounding what it means to believe on Christ. He had been presenting the fullness of the truth that he found in the person

a

6

7/3

o Christ. He was to administer that. 2. He was to make all men see something. See what it was necessary for them to learn. He was to open their eyes to enable them to turn from Satan unto God. His commission was to make men see something. When he wrote to the Galatians he said, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?"

His preaching was of such power, such reality that when they heard it they saw Christ crucified for them. It was His commission to make men see the unseen.

Third. That even principalities and powers in heavenly places might learn more of God. But first of all was his own personal experience, the unsearchable riches of Christ and his commission to make others see what he saw. So much is involved in simple statements. When Paul saw Jesus in the way, he saw himself in that light as he had never seen himself before; and after he had seen himself and Christ, then he was able to see what things were gain to him. "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. . . . I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I ~~xxxxxxx~~ have suffered the loss of all things." Phil. 3:7, 8.

That was what he saw in the light that shined in the way. When that light shines that way, there is no further necessity of impressing any one with the need of meekness, humility, and the sense of one's need.

The next scripture: [Brother Palmer reads] "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of ~~the~~ men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power."

[Elder Prescott continues.] The warning is, Let no man make spoil of you through a philosophy that is not the Biblical philosophy." The biblical philosophy puts Christ in the forefront; the worldly philosophy shuts Christ out. The whole difficulty with the world to-day in its efforts to reform, as Brother Daniells, was saying, is

that they are trying to reform without Christ. It is an utter impossibility to reform the world while shutting Christ out.

A. G. DANIELLS: It grows worse all the time. It is a disease that the remedy does not touch at all.

W. W. PRESCOTT: It is just as true of our preaching and our teaching. It applies very closely to us. There is a tendency some way to substitute something else for the simple, personal Christ. We must get back to that. [Voices: Amen! Amen!] When we recognize that the difficulty with the world is that it is trying to reform the world without Christ, why should we join in the same effort, and leave Christ out? That will not help. Certainly there ought to be in this movement such a revelation of Christ as will draw those who are looking for a change to the better. But it must be with personal experience. It is not something that we can take and hand out to somebody else. It is just as it was with Christ. The greatest thing He taught was Himself. The greatest thing He contributed was Himself. When that woman touched His garment, He perceived that something had gone out of Him. That is why they said they were astonished at His teaching, for He taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes. There was in His very teaching that authority that comes with His personal presence.

In this group of texts I desire to emphasize that which we must see all through the Bible,--This idea that the center of Christianity is not a doctrine, but a person. Do not understand that I belittle doctrines in the least. We shall come to that later. But the greatest factor in the world is Christianity, and the center of that is a person. Our relation to this whole matter is a relation

to a person,--a personal relation.

A. G. DANIELLS: Just a point there Brother Prescott: Isn't it just as futile for us to single out doctrines and write and preach in a masterly way on a doctrine severed from Christ, just as an intellectual thing,--isn't it just as futile to try to reform the world that way as any other? without Christ?

W. W. PRESCOTT: Yes, we put ourselves then on the same ground as the scribes and pharisees.

A. G. DANIELLS: So this Bible Conference should help us to come back so that our preaching of doctrinal truth should center in the right thing, and that should stand first.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Pardon me if I speak briefly of a matter of personal experience. When I started out and tried to preach, I was without any special training in a Bible institute or anything of that kind. As I had observed and heard, I thought the thing to do was to prove the doctrines, and I started on that basis,--just simply to demonstrate the truthfulness of the doctrines. I found that I did not seem to accomplish anything, and I became very much dissatisfied with it. Then I got a new vision, almost like a personal revelation, like a person speaking to me. I cast the whole thing aside, and started in the simplest way, presenting Christ. I was sure there should be a presentation of this message, and that specific doctrines should be emphasized, but ever since that time my study has been to present Christ first. I do not think we can preach Christ by simply presenting subjects first and trying to lead up to Christ. We must present Christ first, and then work out to the doctrines. He is the doctrine.

Now another group of scriptures: Romans 8:8-10, 2 Cor. 4:10-11, 2 Cor. 3:17, Acts 5:3, 4, and 9, Col. 2:20, Eph. 3:17, Phil. 3:8-10, and Col. 1:27.

In the reading of these scriptures what I want to emphasize is the indwelling of Christ. He is the center of Christianity. He is the doctrine. Now, on the indwelling of Christ, Romans 8:8-10:

"So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness."

"They that are in the flesh cannot please God." What does that mean? It is exactly the same expression that we have in Acts 17, where the Apostle Paul in preaching said, "In him we live and move and are." But in order to try to give the meaning, our translation reads, "Have our being." But it is just the same very, "are."

Ye do not have your being in the flesh. Any one who has his being in the flesh cannot please God. But then it changes and says But if Christ be in you, the body is dead.

The first expression is "Spirit of God," the second "Spirit of Christ," and the third "Christ." What does it mean when you have those three in that connection? Synonymous. Then Christ in you is the Spirit of Christ in you, which is the Spirit of God in you, and if you have that experience, you do not have your being in the flesh. It is not the fleshly life, it is the heavenly life.

2 Cor:4:10, 11: "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body? For we which live are alway delivered unto death ~~for~~ for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our ~~body~~ mortal flesh."

Death precedes the manifestation of Christ, and unless we are willing to pass through the experience of death, we shall not pass into that experience of life. That is fundamental.

The next scripture: 2 Cor. 3:17: "Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

What I want you to note is just the same as in Romans 8:8-11. The Lord is the Spirit. When the Spirit is present, He is present. When the Spirit is not present, He is not present, and we only have so much of Christ as we have of the Spirit. We can only know Him through the Spirit. We can only ~~xxx xxxxxxxxxx~~ have so much of Him as we have of the measure of the Spirit.

Acts 5:3,4, 9: "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God. ~~Th~~ Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? Behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out."

Notice the three things here. First, lying to the Holy Spirit, which is set forth in the next verse to be lying to God. What does that mean? It means that when you deal with the Holy Spirit you are dealing with God. But note the steps. This omits one step. "Through him we have access in one Spirit unto God." Note the steps. The Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the Son, the Father. We only have so much of the presence of Christ as we have that presence of the Spirit. Through the Son we know the Father. And there is no other way of access, as we are situated now, in the flesh here, there is just one way to God -- the Spirit, the Comforter, the Son, the Father.

Next Scripture--Gal. 2:20: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

Here is where we have the ideal changed into the personal power. Follow his steps. "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk, even as he walked." Likeness of Christ is the aim of the Christian, but how shall that problem be solved? What is the provision that is made in the gospel? It is not an impossible task; not an impossible ideal. It is an impossible ideal to copy it as something outside of ourselves, but according to the revelation of the gospel, a realization of the ideal when that ideal becomes a person within. You may set up all the ideals of reform in the world, you may set forth the most beautiful ideas of reform, but no ideas will save any one -- never. But when the idea

becomes a person, as in Christ, there is salvation; and that is the only person upon whom we can depend for salvation.

Next Scripture -- Eph. 3:17: "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith" -- Yes, that will do. What is the difference between Gal. 2:20 and Eph. 3:17 -- "Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me," and "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith." I would like to have you notice the permanency of the expression -- That Christ may dwell in your hearts. Not simply come and visit, -- dwell in your hearts; that you may become a living temple where the holy God is always seen. "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith."

Phil. 3:8-10: "Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ. And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death."

Now the epistles of the apostle Paul are notable for the development of certain doctrines, but if you follow carefully you will see that he develops all these doctrines in Christ, not apart from him at all. Before his conversion he was a Pharisee of the Pharisees, as touching the law blameless. A Hebrew of the Hebrews. Among the Scribes and Pharisees he would pass 100 per cent. But the difficulty was that it was all apart from his person. When he saw Christ in the way it changed the whole current of his life, and what before had been self

and self exaltation, and righteousness by works, and commending himself to God for what he was and did of himself, all that was worse than nothing now, for his righteousness, he says, is "found in him." You see that these Scriptures bring two ideals out -- first, Christ in us, and second, we in him. "Abide in me and I in you." "At that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in me, and I in you." It is a double experience. That is the experience of the person in Christianity.

Col. 1:27: "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." We deal with the wisdom of God in a mystery. That mystery is unfolded to us in the Scriptures through which we come to the person and see that mystery unfolded in the person of Christ, and that is "Christ in you the hope of glory." We must recognize constantly that in dealing with these spiritual truths we deal with that which to the natural man is simply foolishness. We deal with that which to the world does not appear to be wisdom at all. We appear to the world to be off up in the air somewhere. Now I say, let us keep our feet on solid ground, and not be carried off into a sort of mythical ideal -- a religion which is merely a notion or sentiment. If there is any solid foundation for anything it is for Christianity. It is solid foundation of actual fact. What we must hold to, anchor to, are facts. Then we must know what these facts mean, and that is what we learn in this book, and what we will try to learn more and more. These texts emphasize the facts that the center of Christianity being a person, that person must dwell in us. That is Christianity. We must grasp the meaning of the texts that

set forth this ideal of Christ in us -- that godliness must become a personality; not an abstract teaching, not a mere demonstration, as a problem of geology to prove a theory. The mere proof of the theory of theology has no more salvation in it than the proof of a theory of geometry. Not a bit more. I have heard so much mere teaching that was nothing more than a mere demonstration of the theory that I feel the need of emphasizing this. This idea of preaching Christ is not to demonstrate the theory and then tack Christ on to it. It is not that. It is to preach Christ in the theory. And personally I have found that was a field for the greatest study -- how to do that so that it would not be a theory and then Christ tacked on to it. Not a dry demonstration, a thin exhibition; but that the thing itself should be the exhibition, the thing itself should be the drawing power.

I am speaking now especially with reference to teaching Bible in the school. I think the great thing in the Bible teaching in our schools is that the whole field of necessary truth shall be covered in preaching Christ in person -- a personal Christ. As I said yesterday morning, I am hoping that if there is anything at all to this ideal we are dealing with now, it shall have influence upon our method of Bible teaching in our schools.

This last trip I was out I met a company of our workers four times, had four opportunities, and I tried to impress some of these things in relation to our personal experience and teaching the truth. At the close of the fourth meeting they had a testimony meeting, and one brother -- a worker, got up, and he said, "I am ashamed of myself. As I came to

this meeting I saw a man on the car with his Bible open, and I 125
thought probably he was a minister, so I got in the seat with
him and had a chance to study with him, and I just wound him all
up on doctrines, and I embarrassed him. As I look back, I
am sure I did not help that man a bit. I am ashamed of myself.
I am going to throw the whole thing aside and start over.
Lately I have felt that I was losing my personal experience, and
I hardly knew exactly what to do. I thought I would
prepare a new set of Bible readings and see if there was anything
that would bring back that spiritual part that I was losing.
I am ashamed of myself."

I was attending a Bible institute in China,
with Chinese workers and a few foreigners. After we had been
studying for a few days the different native evangelists
were called upon to tell in what order they would present the
doctrines, and they had written down on the board ~~xxxxxxx~~
~~thoughtsxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ with which doctrine they should begin.
When it came the turn of the Chinese evangelist, who had gained
some experience, he took the eraser and rubbed it all off the
board. He said, "I will rub it all off and start with Christ."
I was pleased that he went at it in the right way. He had got
the vision,-- that it was not ~~xxxxxxxx~~ doctrines which lead up
to Christ. He was going to rub it all out and start with
Christ.

I remember another experience I had. I met a
young man who had just come out from our schools. He had had
only one or two experiences in the summer with the tent work,
and he was going out to heathen fields, and I thought that I
would have a little talk with him before he went over. And
so I talked with him something after this order. I said,

"My brother, before you go out here to deal with these heathen people, let me just tell you that you won't be able to reach these people and to convert them from their heathenism by just proving to them that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, or that man is mortal, or that the coming of the Lord is near, or that Christ is priest in the heavenly sanctuary. You will not be able to reach these heathen people and convert them from their superstition and make Christians of them just from that. You have got to present a living personal Saviour to those people in such a way that this shall take hold of their heart and change their very nature." I talked about half an hour in that way. When I finished talking to him, he said to me, "I thank you very much for this talk. No one ever talked to me this way before. You have opened up a new field." I thought, Where is the Bible teacher who taught that young man, if that is the way that the talk that I had with him dawned upon him. Candidly, I think the teaching in our schools should be so conducted that when our young men go out ~~re~~ from the schools to heathen fields they shall know how to win the heathen to Christ.

Now I feel very earnest y over this matter--that there must be such a handling of the gospel in our schools--in our Bible classes, that there shall be a converting power right there in the class--and that when they go out they shall know how to do the thing.

I have met some others out in the field in two or three different fields. I met a young man who talked to me privately and very frankly. Haxsaid: I found him greatly discouraged. He and two or three others had preesly nearly the same experience and had about collapsed. I asked what was the trouble: "I found," he said, "when I got out here I had not received the preparation to do the work I was expected to do among these heathen people." Now when a man gets out among those heathen, all the thought of his "firstly," "secondly," or "thirdly" or the building up of his doctrine, are gone. Your he athen audience do not know the Book. They cannot even find a passage in it, and there has got to be something beside bringing in doctrine in order to help those people.

I have already told some of my experience out before a heathen audience recently. More than yalf never confessed Christ, and could not turn to the Bible. I spent only two weeks with them, and it was a happy day that last day of the meeting when they testified that they had found Christ in the meeting and accepted him as their personal Saviour and were ready to stand for him.

Now we think that among an intelligent people ~~that~~ we must spend six months more with in order to bind off the work before they are thoroughly converted--How shall we ever finish the work among hundreds of millions of people on that basis? I believe there is a testimony to be born that in itself shall have the power to fully convert the people to the Message right there.

But I think that ought to begin right in the class room; and not simply in the Bible room but the history room, the science room, in every room in fact.; so that our schools shall be essential Bible Schools. Now no one need say that they will narrow down education by this. I tell you I defy the strongest intellect to master that problem completely. There is no intellect that can master it completely. It will be our study through eternity even in the glorified state.

I sincerely believe that our schools could stand out before the world even as did Luther's school at Wurttemberg--as Bible schools. But when that day comes the Bible teaching will be more than the teaching of doctrine--the history teaching will be more than the teaching of history--science teaching will be more than the teaching of mere science--although they all three teach those same things. But the teaching will be away beyond that. The whole problem will be to arrive at the meaning of those facts--to be able to translate these facts of history and science into the meaning of the preaching of the gospel in everything that reveals Christ in the converting Word,; whether the student is in the science or history room he is learning--and learning too on a very solid

basis--~~and~~ learning in fact, not in theory--not simply 129
dogma and abstract theology; The Bible is not a book of
systematic theology, I think that a large part of the Bible is
simply history. And oftentimes those facts are not interpreted
at all. You must take the whole together to find the meaning
of those facts. Now to study the New Testament alone I think one
great mistake we make is in when we are studying the
New Testament, in coming across quotations from the Old Testament
~~xxx~~ we do not refer back to the Old Testament for those quotations
but simply take the statement as it is made in the New Testament
without reference to its ~~original~~ ~~meaning~~ connection. For
instance, you take this simple statement:

"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of
the world," made by John the Baptist to the people in introducing /
Jesus. He presented before them the whole sanctuary question.
It is in the light of that one statement that the whole sanctuary
service should be studied. That is the interpretation of it.
Not to simply stop there in the New Testament, but go through
the Old Testament for the ~~real~~ connection.

A statement in "Gospel Workers" impressed me very
much, which says, The books of Daniel and the Revelation
should be studied in connection with the words, 'Behold
the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.' Now
I take it that means that when we are studying the book of
Daniel we should see the Lamb of God that taketh away the
sin of the world, and be able to make others see it. And
when we study Revelation we should see in it the Lamb of
God which taketh away the sin of the world, and be able to make
others see it.

Now we have studied the books of Daniel and the Revelation too much as exposition and something to tell people about. I made up my mind years ago that personally I was not getting out of these books what I ought to get--notably the book of Revelation--and I started in for a new study from the standpoint that it must have some personal help in it for me. It has a warning concerning conditions I am now in--not simply for the sea outside world. I will be with the outsiders if I do not take that warning to myself that are set forth in that book.

Now I take it these things are for our personal help that are contained in these books, and when the people come to us they want personal help. The last time I studied the book of Revelation it was with a class in Japan, and one of these young men was only with me there two weeks. He afterward wrote me that he greatly enjoyed the studies in Revelation. I thought this was wonderful for a man who had never confessed Christ and had only studied the Bible for two weeks to say he greatly enjoyed his study of the book of Revelation.

DANIELLS: That is what the world needs --the Lord Jesus revealed through his word. I heard Dr. Riley say the other day, telling of the Bible Conference, ~~xxx of one preacher he had~~ listened ~~xxxxxxx~~ about whom he said: "Brethren, I never heard one of our scholarly men butcher homiletics as that man, but I never heard any one expound the Word of God as that man. He used as his text, 'The Lord God is a sun.' He gave us ten minutes of an outline on the subject of "Sun", "Son", "Son of God," "Sun the light of the world." He went on

telling about this man, and from Dr. Riley's account it certainly seemed to be a wonderful experience. He emphasized the thought that he got a new idea. The man had expounded the Ford . It made such an impression upon these scholarly men. And that is exactly what the world wants--an exposition of the Ford of the living God.

Elder M. C. Wilcox accepted the suggestions of the delegates on the matter of partial and plenary fulfillment of prophecy, agreeing that both these fulfillments are worthy of recognition, and citing as examples the prophecy of Elijah.

DISCUSSION THEN OPENED

G B THOMPSON: Is the destruction of Jerusalem a type of the end of the world?

M C WILCOX: Sister Whites makes it so. I have thought that there is a lot in what Alex. MacLaren said, that there have been different great days of the Lord, but everyone looked forward and was in a sense a type of the great day of the Lord that lies just before us. Is not that true in a great many other things and experiences and blessings which God gives, they are a type of the fuller and greater blessings later on.

W W PRESCOTT: Did I understand that you thought that national Israel came to an end in the destruction of Jerusalem?

M C WILCOX: I think in God's plan they came to an end when they said We have no king but Caesar.

W W PRESCOTT: Yes, but what about God's purpose that he announced to Abraham, "In thee I will make a great nation? Is that simply the Jewish nation which is gone now?

M C WILCOX: That nation as an earthly nation, but not the nation of which Jesus Christ is the center. I have seen a great deal in that text in Gen. 49:10: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."

He wanted them to see that which we ought to see now, that all centers in the tribe of Judah, and the one in the tribe of

Judah, Jesus Christ.

J N ANDERSON: What do you understand that the word "peoples" (RV) refers to?

M C WILCOX: I had taken it as embracing all. Not simply the tribes. All of the peoples of God that had come from every source.

W W PRESCOTT: I think we must keep in mind that original promise that will be fulfilled in a nation.

M C WILCOX: That is developed a little more fully in Isa. 45:17: "But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." "For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it, he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the Lord; and there is none else."

His very purpose lies in that, and his purpose will be accomplished.

W W PRESCOTT: Peter in writing to the dispersion says, "Ye are an elect nation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation.

M C WILCOX: Just as in the 19th of Exodus.

W W PRESCOTT: I thought we must keep in mind the nation idea.

A G DANIELLS: Wasn't that nation, up to the time he spoke of, a physical nation?

W W PRESCOTT: Yes, a political entity.

A G DANIELLS: Politically it came to an end, but in the purpose of God it was a spiritual nation, and that work would go right on and they would continue right on.

M C WILCOX: One thought regarding that is in Romans, on the

remnant. Romans 9:27: "Esaias also orieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sane of the sea, a remnant shall be saved." The true remnant, they represented the nation.

An exposition of Romans 11:25 was called for

M C WILCOX: I don't know whsther anyong else agrees with me on this scripture or not. I think that all the fulness is met in our Lord Jesus Christ, and I think that in the first ochapter of John "Of his fulness have we received, and grace for grade," was spoken to the Jewish people, and is met in one of the texts quoted this morning, that "In him should all fulness dwell." Here the fulness of Jew and Gentile was met in Jesus Christ. It a came in when Christ was presented to both Jew and Gentile in all his fulness by the gospel, and from that time on till the present time until probation closes there is no difference between Jew and Greek, Barbarian or Scythian, but Christ is all and in all.

W W PRESCOTT: About the nation. As I read it, the nation is Israel all the way through, political or spiritual Israel, and God's purpose to make of them a great nation is still going on, and will be finally accomplished. "He hath made us a-kingdom kings and priests unto God and his Father." I want to suggest that all outside of Israel are the nations, and Isreal is the nation. We come to Joel. Hers is where I think we find the correct interpretation. Joel 3:9 and onward: "Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles; Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near; let them come up Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause thy mighty ones to come down,

a

27 - 28

7/3

O Lord." Some have said that the word "heathen means Japan, India, and China.

M C WILCOX: No doubt the translation has led many astray.

W W PRESCOTT: Yes. I think it includes Japan and India and China, But I also believe it includes all the nations, for verse 9 says "Prepare war, wake up the mighty men, let all the men of war draw near. . . Let the heathen be awakened, and come up ^{to} the valley of Jehoshaphat." The changes were rung upon the idea of heathen people, and therefore that these nations were Japan and India and China. That is allright as far as it goes, but it is too limited. It is the nation and the nations that will come up, and when we come up to the final battle, it will be one nation against all the nations in the world. I want to be with the nation, because the contest is between the nation and the nations, and I don't want to be with the nations in any way, I want to be with the nation.

A.G.DANIELLS: Tell us how that contest will be between the nations and God's people? What form will it take?

W.W.PRESCOTT: There will be two contending parties in the battle of Armageddon, and I want to be outside of both of them, as belonging to the spiritual nation that will triumph over the world. All the elements of Armageddon are at work now, and it is simply a question of the development of the final crisis. All this greed and selfishness and atheism and denial of God will simply come up to a crisis in which they will absolutely break loose against each other. In that day spiritual Israel will win the victory of the whole experience down through the ages.

M. C. WILCOX: Isn't it true that whether they are together or apart, the great battle will be against Christ and His people?

W.W.PRESCOTT: The whole effort back of these movements is the person. All this conflict is between two persons, the incarnation of Satan on one side, and the incarnation of God on the other, and we are coming up to the final contest. In that final contest Spiritualism will lead on Satan's side. I do not understand that Spiritualism will win its victory with guns and liquid fire and all that. But I am greatly distressed to know how we are coming up to Armageddon, how we can take sides in it according to the country in which we live.

J. N. ANDERSON: Where do you find the three parties in the picture of Joel?

W.W.PRESCOTT: The conflict is all the way through, with two leaders--

J. N. ANDERSON: It seems to me the picture is this, the Christian against the whole world.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Brother Wilcox brought out the idea that all prophecy is conditional upon the attitude of the people toward the prophecy. I would like to call attention to a further principle of interpretation, and that is the question of interpreting prophecy on the basis that all prophecy--all the ~~xxxxxx~~ separate parts of a prophecy, rather, are but parts of one complete whole, and that in order to interpret any part correctly we must have a vision of the whole. I think we have made a very serious mistake. We take the book of Daniel, and as far as I have observed, the tendency is to take that book as a separate book, as entirely distinct, ~~from~~ or very largely distinct, from the other prophecies, and just interpret that book by itself. But I take it that no one can properly interpret the book of Daniel who does not interpret Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It is true that Jeremiah seemed to speak almost the opposite of Isaiah.

VOICE: He lived a hundred years before.

W.W.PRESCOTT: That teaches another thing as to the question of applying things with reference to time. Pardon me, Brother Lacey, but you read a quotation from the spirit of prophecy concerning conditions in 1890. Those who were connected with the work at that time knew the background of that. It was after the conflict of 1888, at Minneapolis, and the then-leaders declined that light. I think we should be just as careful in applying the spirit of prophecy to have regard to the time and circumstances as with the Bible. I have known men in the publishing work to quote the statement that "Where we have one canvasser we ought to have a hundred," and apply that always without re_gard to how many times the number has been multiplied.

In the matter of the interpretation of prophecy, we must have the whole picture in order to be able to give an adequate idea of it. To me it is just like taking one of these map puzzles and picking up a piece and trying to describe it. I could not tell much about a certain piece until I had it fitted in with the others, and knew just where it belonged. If I pick it up by itself, I may guess right or I may guess wrong,--probably wrong. The same is true of smaller sections, such as verses.

VOICE: What about Nahum's chariot?

E.W. PRESCOTT: Yes, first it was the railway train; now it has got around to be automobiles. I do not like that kind of interpretation.

But speaking of smaller sections: Joel speaks of "multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision." Then we read in the good Review that we held a tent meeting at such a place, and so many accepted the Sabbath, and we left so many others "in the valley of decision." That is a very bad place to leave them. But you read the connection, and you will see that such a use is an absolute perversion, that it has nothing to do with deciding a matter.

I have heard the phrase, "They shall see eye to eye," but when you come to interpret it, you will find that it has nothing to do with unity. I think such superficial interpretation exposes us almost to ridicule. For instance, I heard a good brother say recently that Isaiah foresaw the publishing work of this denomination, for didn't Isaiah say, "How beautiful upon the mountain are the feet of them that publish good tidings." I felt that I wanted to get up and shake that man. It seemed to me like a degrading of scripture to handle it in that way. What can we do to stop this perversion of scripture?

C.M. SORENSON: Set the schools right and get people into them.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Certainly. Now I think the best kind of preaching is the exposition of Scripture. We have too much formed the habit of taking a text and preaching from the text, and getting so far away from it that no one knows what conclusion we draw. We substitute a sort of philosophy of our own instead of an exposition of the Scriptures. I have found this in dealing with Bible teachers. We need to let the Scriptures be their own expositors. This will do a great deal more than argument or oratory. And I think that we should train ourselves and our students to be expositors of the Bible. Teaching the Word -- not simply teaching principles; building up a great pyramid wrong end up. It tips over too easy. If we build on a solid foundation it will not tip over the first time any one touches it. That is what I would like to impress, Brother Chairman, the absolute need of reform on the question of interpretation, that does not take from books, and chapters, and texts that which gives an entirely wrong interpretation. I heard it expressed this way: Not in the version (?) or in the text or chapter, but in the book as a whole,

ELDER DANIELLS: That is the point that Brother Wilcox made -- the law of the context.

ELDER WILCOX: It settles all the problems to treat the whole book in the context of the book.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Let the book itself define our terms. The covenant, for instance. Webster defines "covenant" as meaning so and so. Webster does not deal with our question at all. Webster is not defining the covenant of the Bible. You have many such things as that. You find a definition outside the Bible and then build to that. I think we should

study the Bible and get our definition from the study of the Bible, rather than study the dictionary and then try to build the Bible around that.

QUESTION: (Elder G.B.Thompson -- a few words, could not understand)

W.W.PRESCOTT: I suppose they did. They had to use the dictionary. But to take our meanings for the Bible out of the Dictionary is a misleading idea. You take that very word ---(?) There is to this day great controversy over the Greek word-----, whether it is the proper word translated from the Hebrew. It is difficult to get any sort of work to express what that Scripture means, and they must get a meaning to aid the translators from the technical definition of the word. It is just that way, only in lesser degree, in the Far East when you have to put in meanings, when you have to put characters in order to express the idea. Passing a school in Canton I noticed a sign of four characters. I had learned enough to know that the first of them stood for (3), and I thought that three were in charge. On inquire I learned that the sign means "Three Elements Learning Hall?" He said, This is the place where the mental, moral, and physical are ~~xxxxxxx~~ trained. That gives an idea of the difference in using a word regardless of definition. Many times the definition of a word as set forth in the Scriptures gives an entirely different idea from the dictionary definition.

QUESTION: (A few words -- did not catch)

W. W. PRESCOTT: You cannot depend wholly on the classical definition of Greek. You cannot depend upon that altogether, because the modern use of the Greek is different from the classical use.

H. C. LACEY: Does not the Bible practically define itself in a technical way? But there are texts in which these terms are not defined. Take the word "believe" ("beloved"?) You cannot define that in the classical language.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Referring to Heb. 11:1. We do not take the dictionary definition of faith. We do not find it there.

QUESTION: G.B. THOMPSON: Suppose in reading the Bible I come across a word, such as the word "covenant," for instance, and I do not know what it means; what should I do?

W. W. PRESCOTT: If you go to the dictionary you will find the definition of "covenant" as "an agreement between two persons," and if you take that definition you are back under the old covenant. Read the Bible and find in the Bible a definition of the term "covenant." If you keep on studying the Bible you will find somewhere a statement that will enable you to understand what it means and all about it.

H.C. LACEY: I understand you do not believe that we should dispense with the dictionary entirely?

W. W. PRESCOTT: O no, I do not mean that we should throw our dictionaries on the scrap heap. But in our study of the Scriptures we must get the meaning as found in the Scriptures, and our dictionary definition must accord with

the Scripture use of it, whether in Gresk, Hebrew, or English.

QUESTION: Is it all right to use the two together?

W. W. PRESCOTT: Much depends on which you let govern when you come to these critical things. If a man takes Webster's definition of "covenant" I think he is going wrong.

M.C.WILCOX: By studying the Scriptures one's knowledgs can be infinitely enlarged upon, and the Bibls will give a great deal better definition of the word than the dictionary can possibly do.

H.C.LACEY: Is not the Bible its own lexicon, its own commentator, its own encyclopedia. It is complete in itself. (Explains in regard to a statement which had been read -- did not want to be understood as "lambasting our writers. . . Did not intend to read that extract with any men in mind.") There is one point that I would like to mention in addition to what has been said this morning, in reference to the application of the law of precision. In Joel 3:14 we read the statement "multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision", but in the original we find it stated "valley of precision," which gives an entirely different meaning to our Bible study. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ We must find out what the word meant back in the olden times -- find out what it meant when Jeremiah wrote, what it meant when Hosea wrote. I find that the New Testament used the Old Testament texts out of their precise meaning. This is illustrated, for example -- "I have called my son out of Egypt." It is impossible to mistake ~~that~~ what it means in the book of Hosea. It meant, "I have called my Son out of Egypt." Of course there is a

Spiritual value to it. Matthew quotes it, and when he says "Out of ^{fulfilled} Egypt have I called my son," and this was ~~xxxxx~~ when Joseph and Mary ~~wxxx~~ brought Jesus out of Egypt in the infancy of our Lord.

In the Old Testament there is a text which says "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn," and the apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 9 states "For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope." If we take this text in its precise meaning, we should say that ^{not} the ox must ~~xxxxx~~ be muzzled when he is threshing, but must be permitted to pick up sufficient for himself, and this same principle applies to ministers being supported by the people.

I might refer to a little incident ~~in my life~~ that illustrates the spiritual meaning of a text differs from that which is sometimes applied to it. A lady had saved up a considerable sum of money to get a carpet. After much saving and hard effort the carpet was bought, and was placed in the front room. Now the girl who worked for this family one morning in starting a fire in the kitchen carried a pan of coals from the front room grate, and in doing so the coals melted the pan, the coals dropped onto the new carpet, and ruined it. That hurt the lady of the house so that she absolutely ~~lost~~ her peace of mind. It was a great trial, and she took comfort from the text in Hebrews "And took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing that in yourselves ye have a better and ~~xxx~~ an endearing substance." (Laughter)

Now that was ~~that~~ a misconstruing of the meaning of the text. It seems to me that the Bible is a living word. I believe in this law of precise meaning absolutely, but I think we ought to be broad enough for the Lord to use it in different ways.

PROF. SORENSON: There is a point on that text in referring to the context. Joel that I think illustrates the value of ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ The 12th verse of the chapter defines the 14th verse: "Let the nations bestir themselves and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat, for there will I sit to judge all the nations round about." And then when we come to the 14th verse we see that it means "multitudes, multitudes in the valley of Jehoshaphat." It is the context that explains the meaning of the valley of decision, without any special translation, or anything else. The text itself tells us. That is the point brought out this morning.

L.A. CAVINESS: I am glad for this emphasis of the matter of context. It seems to me that this is where we have to watch ourselves. As illustration, I might be pardoned for referring to my own experience. Some time ago I looked up the expression "the horns were plucked up," and then there came up a little horn. And I remember that I looked in the dictionary and found the definition to be "in place of," but I looked up in the Bible every place where the Greek word ----- occurs; I traced that through, and I found in every case ----- (Greek word) was position and not room. That to me was a study of this other law of precise meaning, and I let the Bible do the deciding as to the meaning as it was used in every case, rather than deciding on the English word.

145

LACEY: There is another law--the law of progress. Truth is given in progression in the Bible. That is fascinating--the symmetrical development of the truth. Take for instance an illustration in the book of John. The words "light" and "believe" are examples of this, both found in the first chapter. He tells us, "that which was in him was light," That is developed in Jesus himself. Light is found to be a quality not quantity. It is a spiritual way of living. And the word "believe" is "receiving". Throughout the entire gospel of John there is a development of this step by step. If one takes the word "Lamb" this same progression is seen. The Lamb of God, in Genesis 22 to Revelation we find a steady development of truth. There are in the 21 Epistles 100 references to Christ's death. The same development or unfolding is seen in the teachings of Jesus on prayer. So we have the truth unfolding in logical steps throughout the Bible.

PRESCOTT: Is not that just one phase of a larger application we would like to see our students apply, and that is, that the whole Bible is a progressive development; and they should be able to see how--not simply as a theory--but to see how it progresses from Genesis to Revelation; seeing this development ~~xxxxxx~~ in the Old Testament on into the New.

DANIELLS: We surely must look to our schools to a very large extent from now on--in fact, for years it has been so--because all the young men we are sending out into the ministry, and to the foreign fields, ^{today} are coming out of our schools.

We will now hear the discussion on Brother Bollman's topic of yesterday that was not finished.

PRESCOTT: May I ask Brother Bollman a question? Am I to understand you to say (yesterday) when the sovereignty was

transferred to from Babylon to Medo Persia, Medo Persia to Grecia and Grecia to Rome,--that Medo-Persia did not include Chaldea. (Correction:) It was when Grecia was divided into four parts; did not include Chaldea. I thought that these ~~xxx~~ four kingdoms settled down to the two, Suria and Egypt; but Babylon was the capital of Syria for a long time. Then would you say that these four divisions did not include Chaldea. (Referring to Newton's statement).

BOLLMAN: I did not read any of these things as absolute authority. I do not think we recognize absolute authority, but it struck me as a very good reason for finding all the ten kingdoms west of Rome.

PRESCOTT: Another question: I understood you to say the Lombards came in as one of the ten kingdoms in 487. How then can we be sure the Roman Empire was completed in 476? The old date, you remember was 483, in the earlier edition of Thoughts on Daniel. If the Lombards are one of the ten, and they came in in 487, how can we say the kingdom was completed in 476?

BOLLMAN: I tried to make it plain that these statements from the standpoint of the prophecy were true, and I do not know any place in prophecy where we are held down to 476.

PRESCOTT: Are we to correct our statement on 476?

BOLLMAN: No. As shown in Elliott's two lists it was brought out there were two times when there was just ten kingdoms, and I suppose there were other times where there were ten kingdoms in existence, but I think the prophecy contemplated (the second chapter of Daniel does not give us the number of kingdoms as I view it, but emphasizes the vision "whereas, thou sawest the feet and toes part of potter's clay

and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided."

PRESCOTT: I understand you to agree with Elliott in his ten-kingdom division at 533?

BOLLMAN: Yes.

PRESCOTT: You put the Lombards in there?

BOLLMAN: Yes

PRESCOTT: You cannot ^{say} ~~say~~ how that division was made in 476 if the Lombards came in 533.

BOLLMAN: No. But there was a division before that date. The kingdoms represented by the ten horns are the kingdoms of 533 as I view it. Rome was divided before that.

PRESCOTT: According to that, that division was not completed in 476.

BOLLMAN: 76--not the division of the prophecy--not the ten horns that represented the prophecy--the ten horns in the presence of which another little horn was to come up.

HAYNES: Your opinion is, Brother Bollman, that the ten horns of the prophecy did not constitute the original tenfold division of Rome?

WASHBURN: If Rome was divided into ten kingdoms, must we not look for the fulfillment of this prophecy in the first ten kingdoms we find. It seems to me we will have to take the first ten. If there were ten kingdoms, these are the ten.

CAVINESS: I thought Brother Sorenson gave us only two lists, and the last was given as 533, and this exactly agreed with Brother Bollman's. The last was dated 476, and does not agree with Uriah Smith's as given in Daniel and Revelation.

BOLLMAN: I would like to answer brother Washburn's question. My answer would be this. He states we must take the first ten. I have a key ring in my pocket with three keys on.

When I want to open a certain lock I must use the key that fits that lock, and the others will not do it. So it is when we find in history a power completely fulfilling every specification of the prophecy that is the one that fits .

C P BOLLMAN: I was asked about these things we attribute to the papacy before that date. I would answer that in this way. I have used the expression in the paper, that the papacy at this time, emerging from its nonage or minority, proceeded to do certain things. Before that date the papacy was a boy, and at that time it became a man. And it is true that many things a boy does follow him all through his life, but he does a number of things afterward, and there comes a time when he really enters upon life. The graduating exercises are called commencement exercises, too, because that is the time when the student goes forth to engage in the activities of life.

W W PRESCOTT: I think this does not meet the point because the prophecy says it is the horn that changes the law. Now if you do not get the horn up in 533 you can't say the horn changed the Sabbath before that date. It was another kingdom.

H A WASHBURN: Was there a monarchical power in the church until Justinian declared the pope to be head? This eleventh horn is a kingdom just as truly as the tenth. It is a kingdom a monarchical power, and it began in 533.

W W PRESCOTT: If that is the power that changed the law, we can't say the law was changed in the middle of the fourth century.

H A WASHBURN: Brother Lacey told us of a woman who said she had spanked Emperor William. It was the same person, but he did not have a title. The apostacy changed God's law, and it was responsible for all the acts against the Sabbath. There came a time when it was organized under one man.

W W PRESCOTT: Here is what I would like to say. Hold to the text. The horn power was a kingdom. That kingdom did not rise till 533. The prophecy says it is the horn that changes the Sabbath, the law, and I do not think we can put that back before the horn appeared and say the horn did it, because the horn was not there. I would like to have that specifically met. What shall we do with that proposition that the horn power rose in 533 and changed the law? How can we say that the horn power did it in the middle of the fourth century?

L L CAVINESS: We meet that same dilemma in the Spirit of Prophecy when it says the pope changed the Sabbath. Please tell me the name of the pope that made the change.

A G DANIELLS: That use of the word pope was intended for the papacy. It was not a specific term. It was the power that did it, but before it came to that special stage marked by Justinian.

E R PALMER: It appears to me that if we were to tie down all of the fulfillments of the prophecies to the span of the 1260 days of continuance spoken of in the prophecy, we are involved in serious difficulty at both ends, at the beginning, before 533, and since 1793 and 1798. It seems to me that in view of the fact that this evil principle began back in Paul's day, that it embodied all these things that were powers that were exercised later as a horn, but that they all began back there. I think we have gone astray many times in our explanation by trying to put the change arbitrarily at a date in connection with the papacy at a certain time, but really that time

a

50

7/3

began its work of changing the Sabbath way back in the first century. I think this is true. I think there came a time when that period of 1260 years began in a definite way, in a way that it had not exercised that power before, and there came a time also when that period closes, ~~I-thi~~ and yet much of the most mighty work of that power has been exercised and is being exercised, after the termination of the period. It seems to me that to bring that too definitely within the 1260 year period, it involves us in serious difficulty at both ends, and I think we have a good deal of phrase adjusting and word adjusting in our literature relative to the Sabbath and the papacy to make the thing consistent with what actually took place before the 1260 years and afterwards.

A G DANIELLS: Now then the horn power represents the papacy from its earliest embryonic condition to its destruction, does it not? Now then, is it necessary to place the rise or the establishment of that horn in 533 at the time we say it became a monarchical power? That is the question to me. Is that our position? Is that a right position? Is it a necessary position? Wasn't it a horn power long before then?

E R PALMER: That is a serious question. If the thing was not developing, if it was not growing for much more than 1260 years, then there were certain developments that marked off the 1260 years in a definite way.

A G DANIELLS: As a living, acting power, the beast, through various steps and at various times did various things. Now one of the things that little horn did was to attack Jesus through

his law and his Sabbath. It certainly did it before ever that decree of Justinian came. Is it safe to not recognize it as a horn power before that decree was made? If that is not necessary, then where is the wrong in recognizing that fulfillment of the prophecy when it was broken up into the ten parts?

W W PRESCOTT: Here is another difficulty, and that is, we set the Council of Laodicea at the latest date, earlier than we set the breaking up of the empire, so that you have got that action. If we make much of the Council of Laodicea, it was before the breaking up of the empire began.

M C WILCOX: Shall we take up the beginning of that horn power, the assumption of the power itself, or the recognition of that assumption by the state?

W W PRESCOTT: You take it clear back when Constantine reached Rome, when Attila appeared against him Rome. Was the pope the leading power then? Didn't he turn back Attila? Yes. Then can't we go back even to that time? What was a great step in the assumption of that power? When Constantine reached Rome and the pope appeared? That was in the early part of the fourth century. Now as Brother Palmer suggested, the 1260 years mark a special phase of that Rome power, and there it sort of comes into that prophecy under that theme, but I don't see how we can shut him off back of that, because there are things that appear back there that are very vital.

H C LACEY: I have been face to face with this for some little time, too, and I try to adhere to our traditional view. Our book says 538. We have changed that to 533, and it continues 1260 years. I believe there is a great measure of truth

in that. It appears that the Sabbath was changed before that. The church turned to the observance of Sunday before 533 or 538.

A G DANIELLS: You said our traditional view that the papacy arose in 538. You mean that that is when it received supreme power?

H C LACEY: Could we say that the papacy did something in days anterior to that special time when perhaps the papacy arose in that way to which we generally refer? I have used this little incident that was referred to, about the woman spanking the emperor. An old woman went around boasting that she had spanked the emperor, because she took him upon her knee and walloped him. (C.P. BOLLMAN: She ought to have kept it up. Laughter) It was not the emperor she spanked, it was the same person who by and by became the emperor. I find the Bible treats in this way the birth of Jesus Christ. He did not become the Christ until A. D. 27, but it speaks of him as being born in A. D. 5. That is an exactly analagous figure. The papacy can come up in 538, and yet the postate church was developed before, and by and by it changed the Sabbath.

Can we not have a figure of prolepsis? Some take the sign for the thing signified, as when Sister White says the pope changed the Sabbath. She took the pope to represent that system. She didn't mean to identify a particular pope, but just as a general term. We say This is the home of the King, of the council. "The king" simply stands for the government, and the pope stands for the papacy. The postate church changed the Sabbath. Step by step the change developed, and then the pope laid hands upon the Sunday institute and boosted it.

And so, as it stands today, the great sponsor of Sunday observance is the papacy.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Is it not true, as a fact of history, that the papacy exercised greater political power in the fourth and fifth centuries than it did under Justinian?

LACEY: Certainly.

C. M. SORENSON: We all recognize that a correct explanation includes all the facts in the case. Of course that is the only explanation that takes recognition of all the facts in the case, and that is the ideal explanation toward which we strive.

We have been speaking about reading things into the Bible, and of course that is wrong. But there is another practice that is bad, and that is reading things into history. That is one of the evil legacies left us by A. T. Jones' leadership. His books are full of that practice, and we have consigned them to the scrap heap. They contain some facts, but the facts are biased by a preconceived notion.

Now here is another point: There is no connection between the plucking up of the three horns and the giving of the saints into his hands for a time, times and the dividing of time. If we will keep those two lines absolutely separate, it will be better.

There was no tremendous change that took place in 533, so far as the status of the papacy is concerned. There is that question of supremacy. Do we use that understandingly? There was a time when the papacy was the supreme power in Europe,--from 1100 to 1300. The papacy was not supreme in any ordinary sense of the term during the 1260 years, but he did exercise domination over God's people.

M.C.WILCOX: I have been trying to get a term that is suitable. What do you suggest?

C.M.SORENSEN: The word "domination."

M.C.WILCOX: That is the word I have been using,—papal domination.

C.M.SORENSEN: During those two hundred years the papacy did exercise actual political supremacy over all the rest of Europe and civilization. King John, right in the climax of that period, signed over his kingdom to the pops.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Can you say, Brother Sorenson, that the papal domination began in 533?

C.M.SORENSEN: There was a legal enactment by Justinian at that time. But the actual domination over God's people was tapered off at the beginning and at the end for the elect's sake. It seems to have been lessened somewhat at the beginning, but more especially at the close of that period.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I know, Brother Chairman, it was a great surprise to me after I had read our books when I actually read history and found that the papal supremacy was only from 1100 to 1300, and gradually rose to that climax, and then gradually faded out. I think we have used that term "supremacy" very carelessly. We have heard and we have read how that in 538 the pope became supreme, but it was in that very year that he was absolutely humbled.

C.M.SORENSEN: That was one of the worst years he ever had.

W.W.PRESCOTT: And yet you read in our books and hear in our sermons that in 538 the pope became supreme. If there is any way of correcting these statements, I wish it might be done.

W.L.BIRD: The Dark Ages should be considered in the same way.

C. P. BOLLMAN: I would just like to read the prophecy. ~~xxx~~
~~xxx~~ "After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had

great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns."

That is a picture of 478.

"I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were threes of the first horns ~~were~~ plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyss like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things."

When did this little horn come up?--then, or two or three hundred years before? ~~It says, "I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them."~~ It says, "I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them." And the term "another" conveys to my mind that the ten horns were there when it came up. It came up "among them." They must have been there or it could not have come up among them, and they must have been there or it could not have been "another" one. It seems to me that we shall have to solve it along the lines suggested by Professor Lacey. I think we attribute to this power some things that were actually done before.

A. G. DANIELLS: This is very interesting and very profitable, and what has been said here shows a need of careful study and comparison of views and teaching.

(Adjourned) to 3:00 P.M.)

Opening of afternoon session--Elder Daniells in the chair.

ELDER DANIELLS: The subject is the study that Brother Prescott is pursuing. Would you like to introduce it, Brother Prescott, with a word again?

W. W. PRESCOTT: We are studying the personality --the person as the center of all Christianity, rather than a doctrinal center; the ideas made personal in Christ, rather than mere theological ideas apart from the person. And then we were coming to the question of the personality of doctrine; that the doctrines that we are to present are to be presented as personality and not merely as abstract ideas.

A.O.TAIT: I do not know as I understand your thought, Brother Prescott, about personality of doctrine.

W. W. PRESCOTT: We have not come to that yet.

C.B.HAYNES: I have been very much helped by the studies so far, but the question arises in my mind, that it is easier here to say we should teach personality of doctrines than it is to do that. Do you propose before you close your series to take up the method of teaching as well as the presentation of these things too?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I cannot do things as sample ways of doing things, for the reason that the only way that it can be done is to meet a need, and the Holy Spirit is not given to us as a sampler; and therefore I never try to exhibit samples of ~~xxxx~~ how I do things. The only way we can do is to do it when there is need; but it cannot be done as an exhibition in order to meet somebody's needs. But I do intend to

suggest some things, Brother Haynes, give some guide. I fully agree with you that it is very much easier to lay down a sort of general attractive proposition in this matter than it is to do the thing. But the only way I know how to do the thing is by much prayer and by much earnest prayerful study. And I have been simply trying to do the thing for quite a number of years now -- just trying more and more, and seeing more and more in it the more I try to do it. When I go out and teach this is my platform of teaching. This is my way of teaching whenever I go out anywhere -- camp-meetings or anywhere else. I do not know any other basis. I know only one subject to teach, and that is Christ and his salvation, and that includes everything that I know of to teach -- whether prophecy, or more directly what we call doctrinal teaching (I do not like the expression as an especially designating expression), it must all come under the general expression of our personal knowledge of him and our ability to present him to the people. It may be as we go on, Brother Haynes, some of these things you have in mind will develop.

C.B.HAYNES: Personal experience grows out of the experience with God, and we form doctrine through our personal experience. Is that the understanding?

W.W.PRESCOTT: There is a sort of interrelation which makes it difficult to separate them. But I think it is that our knowledge and comprehension of doctrine in the sense that we talk it, is through a personal experience with Christ, and it is a personal experience within. They help each other, I think. I would not try to separate them absolutely,

but the way to gain a proper view of any doctrine of salvation is to see that in Christ. "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead." In the Modern form, "In him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden." I like that better -- "in him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden." To unfold that which is hidden, to be able to see that which is hidden is the anointing and the teaching of the Holy Spirit. Human intellect cannot unlock that hid treasure. We pass right over, and do not see it or comprehend it. But when we deal with all doctrine as living, personal things, then we have that good experience, that which belongs with it. Theory and abstract teaching of a system of theology, may become lifeless, just as the theory of geology, or any other scientific work.

C.B.HAYNES: Whenever Paul seems to set forth a doctrinal statement he never closes a doctrinal statement without a transition from the doctrinal to the personal. Take for instance the doctrine of the resurrection in the 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians, which is one of the greatest arguments, I suppose, that can ever be adduced -- argument after argument to substantiate the point that there is a resurrection of the dead, and then at the close he says "Wherefore"-- because of this, "my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, always abounding in the work of the Lord." It seems to me that he makes a personal application, that of setting forth of a personal experience which ought to follow the mental assent to that doctrine. Is that what you have in mind?

W. W. PRESCOTT: In the epistles of Paul we find the richest development of doctrine, but as we read these epistles we find that the doctrines are developed as matters of experience, and they are given to us as matters of experience, in order that they may be received as matters of experience and administered as matters of experience. Take the case of Paul himself, when he was called upon to defend himself before King Agrippa, he based his whole defense -- the charge was the difference between the Pharisees and the Sadducees over the question of the resurrection. He said, "I stand and am judged of the hope of the promise to our fathers." Then he goes on and asks, "Why do you think it is a thing incredible that God should raise the dead?" What is his argument to substantiate the idea of that teaching concerning which the whole question was raised? It was his experience when he was raised from the dead, his experience on the way to Damascus, when the light shined upon him, when he got that entirely different viewpoint, that was the resurrection from the dead to him, and after that he believed in the resurrection from the dead; and he presented his experience ~~xxxx~~ rather than an abstract argument.

You take the development of doctrine in the epistles, the development growing out of the experiences in the churches. In the Corinthian church it was reported that there were divisions among them, and that was the basis of his letter. It was because the Galatian church had been turned away to a different gospel that he wrote the letter to them. There is one beautiful touch between the Authorized and the Revised versions. The Authorized Version says "another

gospel, which is not another." Two different Greek words translated on the same word -- one means different, another means the same kind. You have been led away by a different gospel; it ~~xxxx~~ is not another gospel -- the same kind as I taught you, but it is a different gospel. It was because they were being led away by a different gospel that he expounded the gospel to the Galatians, and in the course of the exposition he refers to his personal experience of being dead and alive. "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; and yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." But you who were circumcised, you are separated from Christ, you are fallen away, and the grace of God is in vain. In the letter to the Ephesians he expounds the deepest truths of the gospel to which attention has been called that we have in Christ. In the epistle to the Colossians agnostic heresy had begun to effect the church. They had a teaching concerning the creation that left the presence of Christ out of it. He writes his letter, and he establishes his gospel upon the fact that in Christ and through Christ all things are created, both visible and invisible. And so you take it through, and it is largely presented as personal experience, and very little is abstract teaching.

We find the second thought. I think that suggests to us that we should use great care when we take statements out of their setting that we give to them the meaning warranted by the setting. When we deal with the personality of Christ in our explanation of the Scriptures there is an entire elucidation of the theme. The whole gospel, the whole Bible, is an elucidation of the theme. In Gospel Workers

we read, "The whole Bible is a manifestation of Christ." That to me is the key to the way we should read the Bible, the way we should study the Bible and teach the Bible -- that it is simply a manifestation of Christ.

ELDER DANIELLS: I think that we have been a little unfortunate in our conception of doctrinal teaching, or in our terminology, and I am inclined to think from the Bible that it is in our conception, because we read here of Christ and his teaching, "when Jesus had ended these sayings the people were astonished at his doctrine." Matt. 7:28. What was the doctrine that he taught, what did he refer to? Well, here is part of it: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." "Blessed are the poor in heart for they shall see God." This is the highest Christian experience that we can conceive of that is set forth in the Scriptures, and that was his doctrine. So I believe we have made a mistake in fixing up these two ideas of spiritual sermons and doctrinal sermons. This was seen not so long ago in the reports, -- a preacher would say, well, I have given twenty-two doctrinal lectures, and I have given ten sermons on Christian life or experience. We separated that way.

(Daniells cont'd)

163

I think we need to get a different conception of doctrine, that everything that is set forth in the Scriptures from the sirhg standpoint is spiritual, and if rightly conceived will lead to spiritual experience.

Now I would like to answer Brother Haynes question, or at least give a bit of experience, in preaching the doctrines from that center--the center of the Cross. I have tried it. That experience was the best part of my public work I did before I was called to administrative work.

Now there came to me through the teaching of the brethren here in Battle Creek on Righteousness by faith, following the Minneapolis controversy, while I was in New Zealand--some of the reports which were later published in the Bulletin, on this question of Righteousness by Faith. I was so interested in these studies that I sat up late at night studying them, and I got up long before daylight to study these. I studied by the light of the candle as we had no lamps or gas light. To show you how interested I was--one night--when one of my candles had burned out, I got out my match box and struck a match to light the other, and after lighting it, I tried to put it in what I thought to be the candle stick, but after trying unsuccessfully to get it in, I discovered I was trying to put it in the match box. This shows how much interested I was in that subject--Righteousness by Faith.

That subject was so refreshing to me. It was like a refreshing drink from a clear mountain spring.

And I got this conception--that really Jesus was the center **164** of the whole thing. The law was Christ. The covenants were Christ--the Sabbath, Immortality, the New Earth; and prophecy was Christ--the unfolding of Christ's purposes and death and ministry in heaven. This was the idea I had in mind in all my preaching. In my tent back of the pulpit I always had a large motto of "God So Loved the World," or some such expression of Righteousness By Faith, and that was the central thought and theme of my public effort.

When I took up the study of a prophecy I showed that prophecy was given by Jesus Christ. It was his message to the world. "And now we will read his message. We will give an unfolding here of his message and purpose to us," I said. I proceeded with that thought--of course first showing that Christ was the Son of God who came to the world to redeem lost man, and that he had given us this word, and we must look at all we found in this Book as coming from our Lord and Saviour who died for us on Calvary. By getting the mind centered on that, the thought tempered and the heart softened by this thought of the great gift God had given to save us--it opened the way for the people to receive the message, and winding up with "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven"--the Lord Jesus Christ--set up a kingdom which shall not be destroyed--I was able to preach the prophecy as the gospel from the standpoint of the cross.

Now when I came to the law and the Sabbath it was not difficult to bring that thought in. What did Jesus die for? To save us from our sins. What is sin? Transgression of his own Law I simply connected the Law and Christ. I showed that his Law

was so dear to him--that the foundation of ^{his} Government--that he' 165
could not save me only by dying for me and taking my place.
Now I had no trouble to impress upon my audience the majesty of
the law proclaimed on Sinai without being called a Legalist.

When I came to the Immortality question I preached
it from the standpoint of "life only in Christ." Our life
is hid with Christ in God. I took it up as life through
Christ, and emphasized the glorious life he brought to us--without
first hitting them squarely in the face and telling them that they
were not immortal but died like the beasts.

Of course I did not do this at first. I remember driving
about two thirds of my audience away the first time I preached
on this subject. I had thought the thing to do was to prove
to them that a man was mortal that when he died he was no
different from an animal, quoting that text where it says
"Man is like the beasts that perisheth." But I soon saw this
was not the way to preach this subject and I changed my method.
And when I took it up and first dwelt on Jesus coming here and
dying for me because I had sinned and had lost my life--the wages
of sin is death--and that he came to give me life and "he that
hath the Son hath life,"--it made all the difference in the
world.

Now tell me what subject in this Book I could not
preach on and bring in the Cross of Calvary.

PRESOTT: Don't you think Brother Daniells, if we
put this teaching of the righteousness by faith in our
sermons, it would change some methods of preaching? I have
heard sermons on the Twenty Three Hundred Days that were
nothing more than a problem in mathematics.

DANIELLS: --And sermons on History that were nothing more than a forty-five minute period in the schoolroom by a teacher. **166**
This is not the way to get at it.

I do not mean to say I would just have a set introduction and ~~then~~ talk about the Saviour for a few minutes and then glide away; but to hold up all the time before them the great Sacrifice, the great Gift, the great plan and purpose of God, and keep Salvation before the mind, making it clear that we preach the Law because we must obey the law, and that Jesus died that we might obey that law.

My change in method of preaching brought about immediate success. I raise up the largest and best churches,--and these churches have been pillars for thirty years in those fields. That was my experience when the new idea came to me regarding this thing. And I don't see any reason why we can not in a tent or hall proceed from that standpoint in preaching to the people.

I believe brethren this will have a good influence upon us as preachers, ^{in a spiritual sense} and it will remove this idea of "legalism." It will keep us away from the appearance of "legalism" and this "proselyting," and it will make a right impression upon the people; and not only will it create a right impression, but I believe it is right. We go out to preach the gospel of salvation and nothing else. Now what is that gospel? "Christ in you the hope of glory." It is not a doctrine separate from that. It is a truth that emanates in him and comes from him, and should come from him in our presentation and in our conception of doctrine, and I don't think we ought to count a sermon on the two covenants or on prophecy or on the nature of man or the State of the dead--I don't think we ought to call them a doctrinal

sermon; and then a sermon on Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ,
a spiritual sermon.

A G DANIELLS: I think it is an entirely mistaken conception. I think that everything we preach ought to be spiritual. It comes from a book that was given by the spirit, and it is spiritual. We ought not to make it anything else.

A O TAIT: Are our so-called doctrinal subjects, if not presented in the spiritual way, are they doctrinal in the Biblical sense?

A G DANIELLS: No.

W W PRESCOTT: I would like to ask, Is it not true that our method of dealing with so many subjects as making up this message, tends toward this very thing of teaching something apart from Christ. When it is felt that certain subjects, eight, ten, twelve, or twenty subjects must be presented in a certain order in order to give the message, does it not tend toward a sort of divided Christ, and the idea of getting to Christ through some subjects?

I would like to ask in all candor this question of our Bible teachers. Is there a way of teaching the Bible that shall present to students or to people generally, all that they need to know at this time, this special time, for salvation, by just teaching them Christ?

W G WIRTH: I would like to ask for advice. This applies particularly to my ministerial class. I have been teaching the young men that we have been trying to cram too many subjects upon the people. That is, we have taken the Seven Trumpets, the Seven churches, and so forth, and by the time we go all through that, it is about all we can do but preach, and that is about all it is. I have told my boys that I thought it would be much

better for them to take our leading subjects and spend if need be, a week on each one. There is the state of the dead. Why not take a whole week on that subject? More than that, if need be, and not cram so much in one subject, but to make every one deeply spiritual and hold up Jesus Christ to the people. Why if we would hold up Christ more, we might not give the people so much at once, but we certainly would give them a knowledge of Jesus Christ and the gospel of Jesus Christ. Take the 2300 days. I maintain that that subject cannot be handled in one night and handled intelligently to an outside audience. It is too much. It simply becomes a mathematical process. I told my boys to take three nights. Take up to the 70 weeks for the first night. Spend a night on the 70th week, and from there on. If they do that, when they get into that 70th week and the middle of it, they have a beautiful opportunity for presenting the love of Christ. We have been simply cramming that thing into one night, and simply saying that Christ died in the midst of the week, then cram them on to the 1810 years and up to 1944, and the people think of mathematics and miss altogether the plan of salvation.

The same way in the Millenium. We take the beginning of the thousand years and the end of the thousand years. Bless us, I don't know where the people are when they get through. They are all bewildered. When you get the Devil bound and the saints in heaven, all the wicked killed at the brightness of His coming, and I don't know where the people are. Homiletics teaches that that thing is absolutely impossible. You cannot cram in five or six points in one night.

If we would take more time, we would have a beautiful opportunity of presenting and driving home anew the great fundamentals.

We have been trying to cover too much ground. We don't need to take everything we have in a series of meetings. They need to know about the law, the state of the dead, and the sanctuary. How many more of the leading points are there after you get through with those? If they get grounded in four or five, how much more do they need? They don't need the seven trumpets, they don't need the seven churches, they can get that in the process of becoming good Seventh-day Adventists. I think a mistake has been made in trying to cram too many subjects into a tent effort instead of taking up fewer subjects that will give us the opportunity to present more of the truths of redemption.

C B HAYNES: Then after the people had received these five or six points of faith, would you receive them into the church?

W G WIRTH: After they had become thoroughly grounded in them, yes.

W W PRESCOTT: What is the purpose of teaching the 2300 days? I don't want to preach three nights on the 2300 days. Not one night. That isn't the way I view the subject. What Brother Wirth has said seems to emphasize the idea that doctrinal points are the leading things to handle. I don't look at it that way. I don't want the 2300 days as a mathematical demonstration from B. C. 457 to 1844. I want it in reference to the great subject of the coming of a kingdom, and when I am teaching on the coming of a kingdom I want to use it in that connection. But as a demonstration apart from what I am trying

to bring to them as an experience and as to the kingdom coming by and by, it is useless. When I want what is taught in the ninth of Daniel in this way, I use it. But you take Christ's teaching. Tell me where you find a sermon on the state of the dead. I don't call them points, I call them living things.

C B HAYNES: Your idea is that you want to develop in those who hear an experience that this age calls for. Can you develop that full and complete experience as demanded at this time without presenting every one of these particular things we do present?

W W PRESCOTT: I don't want to answer that by yes or no. Here is the vital thing. I may talk with these people night after night about points of doctrine, demonstrate them to them, and cover the whole ground, and yet not do the thing I want to do for them. I ^{listened to a sermon recently} ~~talked recently~~ to a large audience of perhaps 2500 people. What was the subject? The subject was the seven trumpets. The speaker ranged the whole range from trumpet one to trumpet seven. What for? That is what I kept asking myself. He tried to cover such an immense field that he got mixed up himself, and got his periods wrong. He had 361 years and 11 days for his sixth trumpet period, and without demonstrating, asserted that it ended in 1840. I wondered what he got out of it. I thought it was an absolute conglomeration. I don't believe in that kind of preaching. If I want to use anything that pertains to the seven trumpets, it is to help the people into an experience concerning the kingdom of God. The key to the whole thing is the kingdom of God. God's purpose in a kingdom. Just to take points and demonstrate certain features

without regard to the great hope, isn't the thing.

C B HAYNES: That is why you would give an exposition of Daniel 2, because it says "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom?"

W W PRESCOTT: Exactly.

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ A G DANIELLS: But in doing that you wouldn't mystify or leave in a twilight zone that whole line of revelation from Babylon to those kingdoms would you?

W W PRESCOTT: Absolutely not. I have taken up with the heathen people the second chapter of Daniel. Now those people don't know very much about history. They are not historians, but I have studied with them right through the book of Daniel and the book of Revelation. I have had a definite purpose in it, and have used these portions of scripture that they might comprehend and that would help them. I was trying to minister to them, not simply a theoretical knowledge that a kingdom is coming, but to deal with the kingdom of Christ as a present experience in the hearts which is to be an outward revelation of that kingdom. I say don't forget that there were literal kingdoms on earth, and give the dates, too. I don't intend to go into the air. I try to keep my feet on solid facts. What are the facts for? What benefit is it to an outside audience to harangue them? I think we do in our teaching too much of that. That is the way I feel about it, and I am opposed to it. But I believe on keeping our feet on solid ground. I don't believe in decrying the absolute facts of history. Keep right on the solid ground, for there is something to be gained if we will try to teach the thing as we

a

78-79

7/3

ought. When I meet an audience of people that I may never meet again, I want to do something more than to make a mathematical demonstration of a prophecy. I want to introduce them to what will save them in the kingdom.

C.B.HAYNES: That is what I wanted you to bring out, Professor, and that is why I asked that question in the first place. I find a sort of sentiment toward swinging away from the preaching of the doctrines that have made us a separate people, and turning toward an evangelistic plan sort of between the Salvation Army and the Billy Sunday kind. I have been trying to do what you have been setting forth, and I do not want the idea to prevail at all that we have come to the time where we can lay aside our peculiar doctrines and start in to talk about Christ exclusively, without giving any instruction in the doctrines.

A.G.DANIELLS: Recently I have felt that I could begin an exposition of Daniel 2 at the last end, beginning with the 44th verse as my text. I do not believe in leaving the people in a mystified twilight zone of mystification, but the great object must be made clear and strong, and that is the salvation of man by the Lord Jesus.

W.W.PRESGOTT: There is one thing about the 2d chapter of Daniel that I have felt we have missed somewhat, and that is that in the chapter itself the gospel is set forth.

W.T.KNOX: There is one very vital question about this that has occurred to me, and that is the fear that swinging we shall swing from one extreme to another,--the fear that the brethren would not feel obligated in their teaching of Christ and Him crucified to also establish the people in the fundamental things that belong to our faith. Then when another man comes along, an enemy of the truth, he can readily tear down their faith. I just want to illustrate with the tithing question. There is no way in which our relation to Jesus Christ can be more beautifully presented than in the tithing.

A. G. DANIELLS: But it can be presented in this way, that He,

having purchased this world, reserves that for Himself.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I do not want to be quoted as one who believes in leaving this message and going off into the air. At the Portland camp-meeting, from which I just came, we had an attendance that filled the great tent and away outside, and night after night I preached to them on the prophecies of Daniel,--the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth chapters, right straight through. And I tried to stand on solid ground on those prophecies as the gospel of salvation to people, that they should receive right then and there. I do not believe in leaving these great truths at all. But I found it necessary in my own experience to restudy these truths and my relation to them, and bring them to the people on that basis.

E.R.PALMER: Reference has been made to the use of the blackboard and the crayon and the mathematical figuring out of certain propositions in certain prophecies, the time of their fulfillment, etc. Those figures have been a great feature in the presentation, both in print and from the desk. Is this a question of eliminating any of these, or is it a question of putting them into their proper setting as a part of the one and only theme?

W.W.PRESCOTT: That is my understanding of it.

E.R.PALMER: That mathematical explanation has been helpful to many minds in getting an understanding of these things.

W.W.PRESCOTT: In my meetings at Portland I had a blackboard, and used it right along. I believe in being very definite and very exact in presenting these things; but they should be given in their proper setting.

A.G.DANIELLS: Now, Brother Wilcox, will you state what you have in mind further on the question of Bible interpretation?

M. C. WILCOX: I have simply some additions ~~to the~~ to the laws and principles ~~which I have presented.~~ which I have presented.

First, The law of progressive development;

Second, The law of context; and

Third, The law of ancient Eastern usage, all of which, it seems to me, are splendid things for us to remember.

There may be others who have principles to suggest.

A.G.DANIELLS: ~~If you~~ Have you any to add to this list that you use? If so, state them; and if not, you can raise questions about the topic.

J.H.ANDERSON: Was the idea of the historical setting included?

W.W.PRESCOTT: The law of the context would cover that, wouldn't it?

H.C.LACKY: There is one more that I have used, and that is what I call the law of emphasis. There is one peculiarity about the ancient Hebrew and Greek, and particularly the Greek, and that is that the written language expresses all the subtleties of emphasis that a good reader would put into it. Being inflected languages, you can put in toward the front of the sentence the emphasis. The New Testament Bible has much subtle emphasis, and we miss the meaning of the passages when we do not catch their emphasis. For real accuracy one needs to be somewhat familiar with those original tongues. But there are translations in which the emphasis is presented.

Take John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." I think nearly everybody reads it that way. I have heard presidents of colleges read it that way.

But just think what it means when you say, "and the Word was God." The inference would be that He is not now. "In the beginning was the

Word, and the Word was with God"--the eternity of the Word, the personality of the Word, and then, "and the Word was God." In a very simple way, yet a very beautiful way, the emphasis is placed on the word God. That is one of the simplest illustrations of that principle.

There is a text in Romans that reads like this: "God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin." That is rather a queer statement, isn't it? Where does the emphasis lie?--on the word were; "God be thanked that ye were the servants of sin," with the thought expressed that they had ceased.

Rotherham's version is one that brings out the emphasis nicely on these texts.

A.G.DANIELLS: What do you think of his rendering?

H.C.LACEY: It is excellent, though there are many places where you want further study.

W.W.PRESCOTT: You would not use it as a basis of ~~authoritative~~ authoritative public teaching?

H.C.LACEY: Not alone. There is no translation that is infallible.

G.B.THOMPSON: I would like to ask if reading such as you have spoken of is taught in our schools as it ought to be?

H.C.LACEY: No, here we have no teacher of oratory, and we all lament it, too?

E.R.PALMER: I wish to refer to two items. I found myself sort of struggling with those principles of interpretation since they were mentioned. These laws that Brother Wilcox has mentioned are intensely interesting, but somehow I do not fully understand just what is meant by "the law of first mention."

E.R.PALMER: The law of first mention. I somehow did not get hold of the idea. As I understood the statement, it was this: That the first time that a word or a phrase is used in the Scriptures the meaning that is there given to it is the meaning throughout the Scriptures, except as its meaning may be extended as we can see from the Scriptures. Would that apply to all words and phrases? I think perhaps I can illustrate what I mean by referring to the word "generation" in the second chapter of Genesis. Would that definition or meaning of "generation" go all through the Scriptures? And further in regard to the law of precise meaning. There were some remarks made concerning it this morning that somehow confused me as to the relative use that might be made of a text, as to whether we should confine ourselves to the use of the text in the setting in which it appears, or whether they meant that the facts stated there might not be extended through all the experiences of life and apply as a living word in every generation of men. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, just what the meaning of this is.

M.C.WILCOX: By "Law of First Mention" 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.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Now in the 5th chapter of Ephesians and the 31st verse: "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall become one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church." Would the law of First Mention apply to that text in Ephesians?

M.C.WILCOX: It would, I think, and carry it still further.

W. W. PRESCOTT: My thought was, in the first mention was there anything ~~xxxxxx~~ that could be laid hold upon in any way to interpret it as having anything to do with Christ and the church?

M.C.WILCOX: That would come under the Law of Comparative Meaning, in which we take all the passages and learn from them the great lesson that God would have us learn.

W.W.PRESCOTT: The first mention of "serpent" is in Genesis 3. In Rev. 12 the serpent is defined as "that old serpent the devil and Satan." If the serpent in Gen. 3 is an animal, according to the Law of First Mention, would that apply in Revelation?

M.C.WILCOX: I think the thought is clear when we get the passages together that Satan was behind it.

W.W.PRESCOTT: It does not say in Revelation who was behind it.

M.C.WILCOX: He was there, only he spoke through the ~~xxxxx~~ serpent.

H.C.LACEY: That serpent in Revelation was not an animal.

W.W.PRESCOTT: That is what I want to get back to -- whether we can, under the Law of First Mention, say that the serpent in Genesis was an animal and that the serpent in Revelation is Satan.

M.C.WILCOX: I did not say that the serpent in Genesis was an animal. I do not think it is. I think it is Satan.

G.B. THOMPSON: What do you mean by First Mention -- Do you mean the first time it is found in the Bible?

ANSWER: Yes, the first time found in the Bible.

G.B. THOMPSON: If we should read a book out of its order, and find a word in it which had previously been mentioned in another book, how would that affect it?

M.C.WILCOX: The book of the whole Bible.

H.C.LACEY: When we mean the Law of First Mention we do not mean the first time the word appears, but that there are a sufficient number of instances of that kind where the first mention of the topic is made which gives the key to the whole subject in that field. In many instances we might say that is the Law of First Mention.

Take the word ----- "In the beginning God created."

The Hebrew word for "God" there is ----- . And right at the beginning we can see that the trinity is suggested. In the beginning God -- he created; it is singular. There is the trinity in unity. Perhaps we see it in its purity there -- In the beginning God (Greek word stated) created by a single act; and so the unity of the Godhead is beautifully taught in the original Hebrew. And then when the Spirit of God is mentioned, as it is in the next verse, it says the Spirit of God brooded upon the face of the water. The Hebrew word ----- means brooded, and there is a beautiful word, the Holy Ghost represented throughout the Bible as brooding -- characteristic of a bird. There are gods many and lords many, but only one God. And when he says "In the beginning God created" it is given the distinctive attribute of the Spirit of God. We read in Genesis 3 to 15 the account of the first temptation, when the woman was led to eat of the forbidden fruit, and we find three suggestions under which all possible sin is covered. Centuries later John warns against "the lust of the flesh, ^{the lust of the eyes,} and the pride of life" -- exactly these three things that caused the original sin. In the original promise, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," we have the promise of the second advent and then the first advent, and the essential work between -- the incarnation of the Son of God, the seed of the woman.

W. W. PRESCOTT: In the first presentation of the gospel it is the personal pronoun that is used -- "he shall bruise thy head." I like the personal pronoun there.

H.C.LACEY: Made a brief remark, as to applying to first instances -- a brief summing up of his remarks, but his remarks were not distinct enough to be heard at table.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I am in harmony with this law. I did not mean so much to take exception in what I brought up, Brother Wilcox, but to look at it in a broader view, and to show that there is more in the Law of First Mention than we are apt to see.

E.R.PALMER: If I have understood the law, it does not mean that it has universal application. I think I had difficulty in dividing between the important ideals of the laws and my opinions. I was inclined to think that the word "generation" as used throughout the Bible, and as used in our work, was practically the same as the phrase in the beginning. And we have difficulty in determining what is meant in the Bible by "generation." So many different theories are arrived at, and we sometimes feel that we would like to know just what is meant by "generation." And I thought that under this law of First Mention, if it had universal application, we would have the key that would unlock the generation problem.

H.C.LACEY: You must all remember that the word "generation" is made up of two or three original words ---- (explains what these are)

W.W.PRESCOTT: I think, Brother Palmer, the Biblical use of the word "generation" will help us on Matthew 24.

H.A.WASHBURN: Now we have symbols in the prophecies, such as the sun, moon, and stars. According to this law, as I understand it, we will find the first instance in the Bible where they are mentioned. What about when the sun, moon and

stars symbolize ruling powers? How about the host of Daniel 8?

W. W. PRESCOTT: Note the first mention. It says that they are for ~~xxxxxx~~ signs, and for seasons, and for years, and to give light. This is on the first mention rather than the rule.

H.A. WASHBURN: Suppose we come to the wearing of the crown of twelve stars. What would be the rule found in determining what these stars symbolize?

W.W. PRESCOTT: The whole question of interpretation may be an open question, but there is a difference between terms symbolic and literal, and we should distinguish.

J.N. ANDERSON: I wish to mention a personal difficulty. I think it belongs in this part of our study. It is in regard to the coming of Christ. In James it is stated "Be patient, therefore, brethren unto the coming of the Lord." Now it seems that James is writing to people living in his own time, and he urges them to be patient, because the Lord is coming very soon. We usually apply that to our own time, and we convey the idea that James had our time in mind. The question is, How could James say that in his time? How could he believe it? He seems to; he seems to teach that the Lord's coming is very near, right in his own day. We find much the same in the 13th chapter of Romans, and in other passages, where the imminence of the Lord's coming is very clearly taught. We do not see very much of this in the teaching of Jesus, as I remember, or in the teaching of the apostles, but it seems to me it comes out very forcibly in these texts I have referred to, and I wonder how to understand them. It may be just imagination

in my mind.

L.C.CAVINESS: I wonder if there would be a time when this law of First Mention of the conflict might be applied to this generation.

ELDER DANIELLS: This is a subject for one of our studies. Could the question be raised again then?

J.N.ANDERSON: Yes.

M.C.WILCOX: There is no trouble in this with the Law of First Mention at all, and I do think that it is worthy of study. For myself, I have no trouble with it at all. I believe that the apostle ^{speaks} ~~talks~~ of the days in which he lived just as Paul did, just the same as all did, and I believe that when he reached those days we find a further message which is guided by the Spirit of God, just the same as John the Baptist did with the message that had been given 700 years before .

(Wilcox cont'd)

"Who are you?" He answered, "I am not that prophet." "But who are you that we may tell those that sent us?" "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord."

He knew his mission, just the same as those who are hearing this Message know their message. For seven hundred years that prophecy had lain dormant, but when the time came for it to be fulfilled, God raised up the man ~~and~~ to give the message. And so it was with the declarations of the apostles. They spoke not simply for their own time but for all time.

PRESCOTT: Is not the expression in Luke 3:3 "And the Word of God came unto John" a similar instance? Now when the time comes that a message of God is to be given, the Word of God that contains that message, no matter what has been in the past—that word will come to people to give that message.

DANIELLS: As it did at the beginning of this movement.

LACEY: I want to say a word on the law of precise meaning. There is a difference between the law of precise meaning and the law of first mention. What I meant to convey by that idea of precise meaning, was to get down to what the word really means. To illustrate: It says "there is a natural body and a spiritual body; and it talks about the natural man not understanding the things of God, only the spiritual man. What is the meaning of that "natural"? The law of precise meaning will tell one to find out exactly what that means. That introduce an original thought. Likewise with the words, "body" "soul" and "spirit." The body is our physical nature, the soul is our intellectual nature, the ~~spirit~~ spirit is our spiritual nature. "Sanctify you be y, soul and spirit." Our present body is the ~~soul~~ ^{body}.

body . We have five or seven senses, and our body is a material body, but in the day of resurrection it will be a glorified spirit body.

.

(The Ten Kingdoms—Eld. Bollman)

DANIELLS: We will continue with Elder Bollman's subject of the ten kingdoms.

WASHBURN: I would like to know how the scripture in Daniel 7 appeals to the brethren here, which says: "I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots;" and Now as you read that Scripture, what do you think Daniel saw? First, I think he saw the beast, and then there were ten horns. He must have counted them. He saw these horns before he saw the eleventh because he said another kingdom arose among the ten. ~~Was it that~~ ~~another kingdom arose~~ The point is this: Did the eleventh horn stand up complete and then these three other horns were plucked up, or did three go down as the one horn came up.

WIRTH: From the 24th verse it would seem to me the eleventh horn came up, as it says "And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." It would seem to me the ten were there when this other one came up. He was "diverse from" the former horns.

PRESCOTT: May I make a suggestion. If we were standing in Daniel's day and this vision was presented to us,

then we might wonder how it would be fulfilled—whether the 187
coming up of that one would crowd the other three out by
the roots, or whether ~~they would~~ it would come up and then three
horns go down afterward. But now we stand here and look back; and
we appeal to history to decide as to what three kingdoms actually
went down under the influence of the Papacy.

WASHBURN: The question is, What did Daniel see.

PRESCOTT: But it involves the interpretation. The question
is whether we should interpret it from the account of history
as it fulfills that prophecy, or ~~from the same standpoint~~ interpret
it apart from history.

ANDERSON: Is that a safe principle of interpretation, to
interpret a text in the light of history.

PRESCOTT: This is a question he raises as to history.

PALMER: If you were to take the reading of the Scripture
and visualize it so that Daniel ~~sees~~ sees this little
horn coming up as one sprout to crowd out those about it, how
would you in the application make that power crowd out the Heruli?
Did the same power that rooted up one, root up the others? Was
the Heruli uprooted by the same power that uprooted the other
two?

WASHBURN: I do not know as we can see that in history;
we can only infer that.

BIRD: We have always made the statement that
Arianism stood in the way of the development of the Papacy. If
that be true then it is clear that the Papacy rooted out the
three in coming up to do its complete work. In the development
of the Papacy these others were necessarily rooted out to give
it its full place in prophecy.

HAYNES; Are we to understand that there were not any more Arian powers other than these three--The Heruli, Vandals and the Ostrogoths.

WIRTH: You could not say the Heruli were Arians.

M C WILCOX: It does not say that three horns must be plucked up for him to have place. The prophecy does not declare that at all. (Reading) "And as for the ten horns, out of this kingdom shall ten kings arise, and another shall arise after them, and he shall be diverse from the former, and he shall put down three kings." You take in the list given by Brother Bollman, the second list given by Elliott, 533-532. In that he went down after that power across (Heruli). He may have been the element that put them down, but they did not go down until after he was given recognition by the state. Isn't that all that is necessary? Can we not stand on that view of the prophecy?

H A WASHBURN: Do you mean that those three kings were not put down by the papacy?

M C WILCOX: Not necessarily that he might have place.

W W PRESCOTT: I was about to raise that question, whether we have any reason to bring arianism into the question, and as to whether Arianism stopped the papacy, when it did not disappear until away in the seventh century as a sort of official religion. The Lombards didn't give it up until 732.

W T KNOX: I think that application that has been made so many times has been the result of human reasoning rather than what the prophecy says.

W W PRESCOTT: It has seemed to come in as one way of interpreting the prophecy, and that the time of plucking up the horns determines the time of giving the saints into his hands. That is to be determined. It does not say in the prophecy that

there is any connection. We have made that connection, but there is nothing in the prophecy that requires it.

H AHWASHBURN: I do not feel free to abandon the dates 538 and 1798. I believe that the third horn was plucked up in 538. That is the only thing that gives me anything to begin with.

W W PRESCOTT: I would not abandon the 8's. My difficulty has been that the 8's have been held and the 3's abandoned. People say that in 1798 the pope was taken prisoner and carried into exile. But Pope Gregory was taken prisoner and also died in exile. If you choose to make that event the condition of fixing the date, what is the difference between the experience of Pope Pius and the experience of Pope Gregory. The significance of 1798 is in its setting, that is all. That is the only thing that distinguishes it. Otherwise you have nothing to distinguish it. My difficulty has been that the date was set arbitrarily at 538-1798, and when the pope was taken prisoner that ended it. I know another pope that was taken prisoner.

* * * * *

W W PRESCOTT: Look at these important periods that we have. The 1260 years, the 1290 years, the 1335 years, and the 2300 years. Those are important prophetic periods. Suppose we say the 1260 years begin primarily with the decree of Justinian, the 1290 years with the decree of the Roman Council in 503. The 2300 years with the three-fold decree. A decree is something that you can fix definitely, and we have every one of those decrees. When I can find that I find something very definite and positive that I can prove. But when I have to infer that the period begins when the

a

98 -100

7/3

last horn went down and we are in doubt, I don't find a very solid foundation for beginning to build. I think those periods begin with absolutely definite things. That makes a solid foundation.

W T KNOX: A general question. Is it not a fact that our greatest difficulties that we have encountered in the interpretation of prophecy have arisen from our endeavor to read into them or to explain those things which are not themselves revealed in the prophecy? We go outside of the domain of the prophecy itself and bring in human reasoning rather than the revelation of God. In this prophetic period there is no mention made whatever of what these nations were, nor yet when they disappeared, nor the particular agency by which they were uprooted. It simply states the fact that three nations disappeared.

W.W.PRESCOTT: May I add a word on this general basis? I would like to be understood as being a conservative. I thought I would have to proclaim it to you myself. [Laughter] I do not think we should be looking around for opportunities to change what we have taught. We should start with the idea that this message is a true message, and we are not ~~xxx~~ here to tear it down. That is my position. But I stand here; Because we have taught a thing that does not prove that it can not be changed; and when we see clear light, we should advance in the light.

There are many people who have thought that they were taking the word of God for their belief in the return of the Jews, the Sunday Sabbath, and many other doctrines. But we come around with a tent and tell them they must not hold those beliefs because their fathers did; and we ask them to change all their ~~crsed~~ and tradition. I take my stand on the same platform.

G. B. Thompson: Then you do not believe the fathers in this movement were any more infallible than the early fathers?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I believe they were godly men, and that they were led by God.

(Adjourned to Sunday, at 8:00)