

W. W. PRESCOTT (Continuing his study on The Person of Christ):

Matt: 1:23: "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is, God with us."

PRESCOTT: This teaches us how He is the way. He is the way to God by being God with us.

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

This opens up more fully what is meant by the scripture, "He suffered that he might bring us to God." He brings men to God by bringing God down to men,--Emmanuel, God with us.

But notice that another term is used in this scripture, 2nd verse: "The life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father." In John's gospel, the first chapter, "The Word was with God." Here we have the same teaching in different words, and these words emphasise the idea of eternity. It is the "eternal life, which was with the Father."

For what purpose was he manifested? "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship

with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."

He brings men to God, brings God down to men, brings men and God into personal fellowship with each other, and that which unites them in this personal fellowship is the eternal life. That is the whole basis of the question of life in Christ. The life is in the Son. "He that hath the Son hath life."

Turn to 1 John 5:13: These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God."

Now 2 Cor. 5:19: "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." This is the same thought as in Matthew 1:23, but stated in a different way. There it is "Emmanuel, God with us," and here "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself."

Why the need of reconciliation? Isa. 59:2: "But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear." What is it that has brought the separation, that makes it necessary to have a gospel of fellowship brought to us? VOICE: Sin.

Now John 1:29: "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." It is sin that separates, and sin must be taken away in order to bring this personal fellowship.

Isa. 53:6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity

of us all." Now John 1:29 might properly be rendered, He bears the sin of the world.

Eph. 2:13: "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ."

In this group of scriptures, what truths are presented to us? First, that the purpose of Christ and his gospel is to bring men to God. He is the way to God. No one comes to God except through him. Through him we have access by one Spirit unto the Father. His name is Emmanuel, God with us, and, bring men to God, he brings God down to men. Sin has done the separating. The Lord has laid on Him the iniquity of us all. Behold, the Lamb of God that bears the sin of the world.

Those scriptures I regard as fundamental to the whole question. Our whole purpose of teaching the gospel is to bring men to God. That is the essential, the important thing,--making first things first. We shall find that all summed up in the person of Christ.

Let us read another set of scriptures: Ps. 11:7, Ps. 92:15, 1 John 5:17, 1 John 3:4, and Ps. 11:7. (These texts were given to different individuals to read when called for.)

What I want to emphasize in these scriptures is the righteousness of God.

Ps. 92:15: "To show that the Lord is upright: he is my rock, and there is no unrighteousness in him."

1 John 5:17: "All unrighteousness is sin, and there is a sin not unto death."

R.V.

1 John 3:4: "Every one that ~~xxxxxxx~~ doeth sin doeth also lawlessness. And sin is lawlessness."

Sin is the transgression of the law. It was lawlessness that separated between God and man. In order to bring God and man into personal fellowship, ~~x~~ lawlessness must be removed, and righteousness must be substituted. If it is lawlessness that separates, lawfulness must bring together again. Lawlessness has been the cause of all that perplexity. Lawlessness is unlikeness to God, and lawfulness is likeness to God. The purpose of the gospel is to bring us to God. On one side we have sin, unrighteousness, lawlessness, ^{separation,} and on the other righteousness, lawfulness, union, fellowship. We are not to wait until we can cleanse ourselves from sin before we have this fellowship. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from sin, from lawlessness.

There we emphasize this thought -- sin, lawlessness, unrighteousness, is in the very being, rather than in an outward act. The outward act is the expression of the inner being. "For from within, out, of the heart of man, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness. All these evil things come from within and defile a man." Lawlessness, sin, must be taken to extend to the very nature, the very being, and not simply the outward act. The outward act is the evidence. In the same way we have to take the fact that righteousness is not simply something outward. It is in the very being, the very nature. Therefore when we come to deal with this question of doing it becomes a question of dealing with the innermost being, not simply the outward act that can be measured in an outward manner.

(Following texts given out to be read)

Isa. 6:5; Rom. 7:18; Dan. 9:7-11.

These scriptures will emphasize the idea that sin is in the being, and what one is premarily rather than primarily what he does.

Isa. 6:5: "Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips: for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts." Isaiah when he had seen the Lord on his throne did not ~~xxxxxxx~~ think of some specific sin or wrong he had committed. It is "I am -- I am undone." You see the force -- "I am undone" that covers the whole nature.

It is what he is, rather than some specific thing that he has done.

Rom. 7:18: "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." That deals again with this being. There dwelleth no good thing in me, therefore no good thing will reveal itself.

Dan. 9:7-11: This is the confession of Daniel. Notice it. "O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto ~~me~~ us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee. O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgiveness, though we have rebelled against him; neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the prophets." Now this confession opens up further characteristics that we should study. Sin is in the being. Isaiah's confession covers the whole thing -- "I am undone;" in me, in myself there is no good thing. Now Daniel opens up the matter further, and let us see what is found or is ~~taxed~~ unfolded in this all inclusive statement.

I want to call attention especially in this scripture to two or three thoughts. 8th verse: "We have sinned;" 9th verse: "We have rebelled." What is sin, then? Rebellion. 11th verse: "transgressed thy law." Sin, rebellion, law -- see how these three things go together. That is all bound

up in Isaiah's statement "I am undone," but here it is opened up so we can see more particularly what is involved in this all inclusive statement. The thought I want to emphasize is -- we have sinned, we have rebelled; sin is rebellion; transgressed the law. In the light of this we may say that sin means rebellion, disobedience. What does righteousness mean? Loyalty, obedience. Let us get these ideas here clearly in our minds -- sin, rebellion, disobedience, transgressing the law; righteousness, loyalty, obedience to the law. This is a question, then, not of some technical act simply. It is a question of our attitude toward God as King of the universe; a question of whether we are loyal to him, or disloyal. Our loyalty will be shown in obedience to his laws, the same as to any sovereign. Our disloyalty is shown by disobedience to his law. We are to bring men to God; back from rebellion to loyalty; from disloyalty to loyalty. And I like to make it very concrete. People can understand what is meant by loyalty and disloyalty. There is no difficulty in understanding this. When they come to a test they want a man loyal -- 100 per cent loyal. In the kingdom of God this question of loyalty to the country to the King, that loyalty is shown the same as loyalty to any country or being; in harmony with the laws of God. Disloyalty is disobedience, opposition to his law. When we speak of it in the abstract, as a sort of theological dream, we say Sin is the transgression of the law, therefore we must keep the commandments. This is true; but from this standpoint it makes it much more concrete. We deal with this ~~xxxxxx~~ King as a real entity, and our personal relationship to the King as a real relationship. Sin separated us. Sin is rebellion. Lawlessness, disloyalty came

in; we have rebelled.

This world is in a state of rebellion against his lawful sovereign. The gospel is the good news that all of this rebellion and all of this disobedience can be adjusted, and men can be brought into personal fellowship with the Sovereign; and when they are brought into personal fellowship they show their loyalty by obedience to his law. This is a time of rebellion. Everywhere there is manifest a spirit of lawlessness and rebellion. There never was a time when the spirit of lawlessness and rebellion was so manifest in the world as now. What does it mean? Simply the opening up and the manifestation to the universe of what sin means. This is the meaning of sin. It is beginning to show us what this world would be if Satan had the rule -- as god of this world, there would be absolute confusion, rebellion, every man against every other man's hand. What is the purpose of the gospel? It is a very concrete proposition -- not simply to make people feel comfortable and happy; and a man accepts the gospel not primarily that he may get into the Kingdom. He will get there all right; but primarily the idea is to glorify the name of God. And in glorifying God we find our salvation. Salvation cannot be sought selfishly. you cannot get it that way. If one's only thought is to be saved himself, he is pretty sure to be lost, because salvation does not come that way. Just the reverse. In the world there is a state of rebellion. The gospel is reconciliation; we have a work of conciliation -- "We beseech you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." Through reconciliation rebellion is

set aside; and the reconciliation will be shown in obedience to his law.

1 John 3:7,8: Remember sin is rebellion; sin is in the very being. "Little children, let no man deceive you: but he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." Now if you will observe the Revised Version it gives two words to enable us to make the contrast very clearly. "My little children, let no man lead you astray. He that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. But he that doeth sin is of the devil." There are the two things. We see what righteousness means, and we see what sin means. He that doeth righteousness is righteous; therefore, in order to do righteousness there must be a change of nature, change of the inner being. One does not make himself righteous by doing righteousness. He cannot do righteousness unless he has been made righteous. On the other side -- He that doeth sin. There are the two -- doing righteousness, doing sin. He that doeth righteousness is righteous; he that doeth sin is sin, or is of the nature of Satan -- he is of the devil. "For this purpose the Son of God" -- it does not say "Son of man," but "Son of God." The eternal life spoken of in the first verse was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil. "Son of God" -- emphasizes his ability to do it. He is the Son of God. The Son of God was manifested, took the flesh, and became a man, that he might destroy the works of the devil, that we should no longer do sin, but do

righteousness.

(Texts given out to be read)

Isa. 6:3; Isa. 57:15; Lev. 19:2; Luke 1:75; Eph. 4:17-24;
Eph. 3:10; Col. 1:15-17; Rom. 13:14; Acts 3:14; Acts 4:27;
Matt. 27:19-24; Acts 7:52; 1 John 2:1.

We have spoken of the Lord as righteous. Now we speak of him as holy. Notice in these Scriptures another phase of his character --holiness.

Isa. 6:3: "And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." This embraces that threefold song of holiness of Jehovah.

Isa. 57:15: For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." First simply the idea -- holy, holy holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also -- touching the idea of fellowship with the Holy One.

Lev. 19:2 -- Speaking of the children of Israel: "Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy." Here is this idea of the personal relationship to the Holy One; Holy, Holy, Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place; with him also of a contrite heart; Be ye holy for I am holy. He transfers that expression to character.

Luke 1:75: "In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life." This breaks right into ~~xxx~~ this prophecy of Zacharias, in which he speaks of the salvation of the Lord and the oath to Abraham; that purpose of it is that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies should serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness. See how the two are brought together here. The holy One -- the whole purpose of the gospel in raising up the horn of salvation, revealing Christ in the flesh, is in order that we should serve him in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Emphasize these two terms, because they are all inclusive terms, holiness and righteousness.

Eph. 2:10: This shows what it means to serve him in holiness and righteousness: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." This is after he has opened up to them the fullness of the gospel, the fullness of the kingdom of Christ. The 3rd verse of the 1st chapter, "Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." Now he is giving a practical application of that truth, and the importance of our depending on the life of God. Notice the reasons for the Gentiles falling from grace -- they are alienated from the life of God. What is necessary that ^{lead} they may ~~have~~ a different course of life? Answer: By reconciliation with God; fellowship with him. The same idea is expressed -- "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me."

(Prescott--Cont'd)

⁴
Ephesians 2: (Reading) (Attatch this to the last clause we have just read) (Verse 24) "And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and (margin) holiness of truth.)"

Then, Romans 13:14 "But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof."

What does it say in the Epistle to the Ephesians? "Put ye on the new man." It says the new man is created in "righteousness and holiness of truth" (24th verse--margin). Ephesians 2:10 says, "Created in Christ Jesus." There is a difference between them. In Romans it says, "Put on the Lord Jesus Christ. How do we put on the Lord Jesus Christ--Being created in Christ Jesus. "In him were all things created, visible and invisible." The original man was created in Christ. What happened then? He left Christ.. He sinned. Now what is the gospel? to bring him back. How? By resurrection in Christ Jesus. That involves the whole question of incarnation. It is not a question of abstract theology but a question of personal relation with Christ.

Acts: 3:14 (Reading) "But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you." What is the meaning of that word "Just"? In the Revised Version it is "The Righteous One." We have been speaking about "God, righteous and Holy." But we are to put on the new man--the Lord Jesus Christ--Created in Righteousness and holiness of the truth.

Now that involves Incarnation—"God with us".

205

Acts 4:27 (Reading) "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, Both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together." Here again we have the idea that that child--or that servant, ^(Revised Version) was to be the Holy One. God with us. Representing God's holiness and righteousness to us in his own person. You may wonder what relation this is to the "doctrines in Christ," but I would emphasize that salvation, the gift of the Father in Christ, and all that belongs to such an experience, is "in him." He is the bringer of these things in himself; and so we must deal with him personally.

Matthew 27:19,24 (Reading): "When he ~~was~~ set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, ^(Righteous one) I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it." I want to emphasize in these scriptures that he is the "Holy One"--the "Righteous One." That in himself he brought to men the "holiness of God"--the "righteousness of God" in his own person.

Acts 7:52: (Reading): "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One (Righteous One) of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers." Now he came as the Righteous One--as the Holy One to bring down from Heaven to earth the righteousness and holiness of God.

I John 2:1 (Reading): "My little children these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." He is there in heaven as the Righteous One. All these scriptures bring in this idea of the person of Christ. What he is in himself as a Saviour. Why he came here. How he accomplished that for which he came. But you will observe as you study these scriptures and as you read the biography of Christ as manifested here in the flesh--you will see what he regarded as essential in his work of bringing men to God. You have the concrete experience and life manifested in order to destroy the works of the devil.

I feel very anxious that in our personal study and in our teaching and preaching that these central ideas should mold us (amens)--that we do not get off on the outskirts and deal with some little minor terms and technicalities. It may be very interesting at times to state terms, but I feel when I come before an audience of several hundred or two or three thousand people--and I know they need salvation--I know they need an experience with this Person whom they do not know,--I seek to bring him to them in order to bring them to God. I do not think it is the time to discuss minor terms or technicalities when we stand before an audience of people that are lost. The thing to tell them is that which will bring salvation to them, that they may glorify God. Introduce them to a new kingdom. Introduce them to a Person they do not know of.

But in order to do this we ourselves must have a very intimate relationship with and knowledge of him. It won't do to talk "about Christ". We must be in that personal rela-

207
tionship with him that will enable us to bring him to them--not simply bring the doctrines about salvation to them.

I was reading something yesterday that struck me with great force. It was that "Even earnest study to find things about Christ may shut one off from personal fellowship with him."

A brother once said to me the last time I was out at a meeting, "I never saw that before. I never saw the difference ^{about} between the teaching of Christ and the preaching of Christ." And there are many who do not see that difference. If they talk about Christ in their sermons they seem to feel they are preaching Christ.

There is a cry now "Back to Christ. It is not enough for us to preach that at some time 1900 years ago a righteous and just man lived who lived a sinless life,--and go on to tell about how he lived. I meet temptation today--not of 1900 years ago. My need is today. I face sin today; and unless I can bring that Man Christ Jesus today into my life, it will not avail for me. Therefore the Christ of history must become the Christ of experience.

C M SORENSON ON THE EASTERN QUESTION

I have entitled my study "The Pointing Out of Some Values in the Favor of Turkey Constituting the King of the North." I will give a few words of explanation why that title and that mode of presentation have been chosen. When I received this assignment from the Secretary of the Institute, I told him I would rather make a contribution on some other topic. But he said You open the discussion of this topic, and there will be sufficient brought out before its finish. This is a joint production between Professor Lacey and myself. Brother Lacey will occupy the major portion of the time, and indeed his name was first on the list, but somehow, logically it seemed to fall to my lot to begin the discussion. I am glad for this opportunity of approaching this topic from the standpoint of a student.

My reticence about presenting this topic is not due to entire lack of attention. In my teaching it comes up every year. I have been observing the matter, and have a complete collection, I think, of everything that anybody has printed during the last 20 years concerning this question. Nevertheless it has not been a specialty of mine, and this presentation was not placed upon me by the Secretary because of any special ability of mine.

Now it appears from the other assignment of the seven trumpets that the Eastern Question, as in the Book of Revelation, will be dealt with by others, and therefore we are confining ourselves to the eleventh of Daniel. It is really a study of Daniel 11, with the emphasis laid upon the last part of the chapter. I feel that God has greatly blessed us during the last 70 years and more,

as we have studied the prophecies, and I believe that we are entitled to more light upon them as time goes on. I believe in these days of anxious questions in these days when thoughtful men are troubled about what is coming, and because they have seen so many hopes and ideals broken in the catastrophes that have fallen upon the earth that our opportunity to present the sure word of prophecy has merely begun. The mighty angel having great authority is coming down to join the three angels of Revelation 14, and it will be the same message with the same emphasis, with the same force and vitality that began this message, except with increasing power. Men's hearts are made hungry, and it is only the hungry man we can feed.

"Thou must prophesy again before many peoples, and nations, and tongues, and kings." You will pardon me if I enlarge just a minute upon this. I call your attention to one or two statements of prominent men who have recently spoken on this question. There is nothing like refreshing our minds by way of remembrances.

Alfred Noyes, the poet laureate of England, in the Saturday Evening Post of April 13, writing under the title "Civilization Imperiled," gives to my mind a presentation of the great call to us from God, that we may be able to see the needs of men's hearts, and that we may be able to give a more certain sound at this present crisis:

"A few years ago the title of this article would have seemed fantastic to the majority of level-headed men and women. Today it is the expression of a constant thought that troubles all of

us. It is the most level-headed members of the community who are most anxious. Only the irresponsible and thoughtless are unconscious of a vast peril to that slow growth of the ages which we call our civilization. Practical men, with their feet planted solidly on the earth, are looking into the future as into an immeasurable darkness; and they are not sure whether there is solid ground in front of them or whether the next few steps may bring them to the brink of a precipice."

"On the surface, in the English-speaking countries, things are going on very much as usual; but under the surface there has been a change of tremendous and terrible import. The surface is only a very thin skin, and underneath there is a wild intellectual and moral chaos unprecedented in the history of the world, except perhaps in the moral chaos that preceded the fall of Rome.

"It is hardly too much to say that if Great Britain should lapse into disorder for one weak moment the whole future of civilization would depend on one country and one alone -- the United States of America. . . . and there are forces working in the United States today, working as they have never worked before, to undermine and overthrow even that last fortress."

"A declaration of right, a reassertion of those great simple fundamental principles upon which our ~~vital~~ civilization is built, is the first necessity. Unless the war was fought for this purpose all its agonies will have been utterly wasted.

"It has been said that the war was fought to make the world safe for democracy. It has also been said that it was fought to make democracy safe for the world. But both of these aims are included and made one in the fundamental aim of reasserting the rule

of right. =A right democracy will be safe for the world; and a right doing, right thinking world will be safe for democracy. Democracy and freedom depend upon the establishment of justice and a law before which all men are equal.

"They have nothing in common with the insane leveling process which would reduce the hill to the plain or cut off the feet of the tall man to make him equal to the short. Unless Nature herself is abolished we must follow the universal laws of Nature. Fire will continue to burn the hand that defies it; and it is only by our observance of law that we live.

"The law is our only pathway through chaos; and as the old Scripture said, "Thy word is a lantern unto my feet." In ~~the~~ the moral world this is equally true. The soul of humanity cannot live without religion; and our only hope is that mankind may now return to the first four words of the Bible: "In the beginning God."

We are conscious in the great study that we have been able to carry on all through these years, that we could point men to a God who governs circumstances. Nations and the affairs of this world are working out the great purpose of his will.

"One reason for this hopeless dilemma is the almost complete downfall of religion among the so-called "intellectuals" of Europe. A quarter of a century ago all the creeds went into the melting pot; and there are very few among the political or "intellectual" leaders in Europe today who would describe themselves in private as anything but complete agnostics with regard to the eternal foundations of justice and right."

I think I must not read more of this, unless it should be just one thing here about men of criticism. Prophetic interpretation has been always greatly subjected to criticism in the last few years. That is evidence to me that God is stirring up a people to give the sure word of prophecy in spite of those who would weaken our hands by criticism.

"Attacks upon certain religious dogmas and traditions have developed into something like a dismissal of the first postulates and axioms of a sane existence, one of which is that the greater cannot be produced by the less. We have developed a system of explanations of the universe which are in direct contradiction of this first postulate. We explain man by something less, and that again by something less, until we have whittled away all things visible or invisible. We have deliberately taught ourselves to look downward into nothingness, though true science and true reason and every natural instinct of religion would teach us to look upward to the ever-expanding heavens and the infinite power of God."

So much the for poet laureats of England.

Here is a concise statement by A. Clutton-Brock in the Atlantic Monthly for July, 1919, under the heading "Religion Now." He says:

"The war has increased the desire ~~for~~ for belief, not only in the weak, who seek consolation at all costs, but also in the strong, who see that science has not made us wise about the nature of the universe or our own nature. We know in our hearts that not only the Germans, but all of us, have been fools: [A. G. DANIELLS: Hear! Hear!] Heard? [SORENSEN: That is a good confession, isn't it?] We have believed something sillier than the silliest version of Christianity, namely, that mankind was advancing toward perfection by some mechanical process called evolution."

Later on in the article he takes up the Catholic Church and shows where they fall short. He takes up the Church of England and shows where it fails. He takes up Modernism, Christian Science, the Nonconformists, and the Salvation Army, and says that none of them give the real thing we are looking for.

VOICE: Is he a Christian?

C. M. SORENSON: I cannot say for certain, but I think not. He is wishing for some one to rise up and give them just the right thing.

[Reads again] "There is the Salvation Army; but it is possible only for the poor. It is evangelical in the old sense, offering men individual salvation. It can and does, cure them of drink, but there is no philosophy in it."

There is philosophy in the message that we have for the world. It is cheering to me to review our own message in connection with this groping and questioning of the men of the world at this time.

Concerning Christian Science, he says that is the opposite of the Salvation Army. He says: "Perhaps Christian Science was born in too prosperous a society; anyhow it seems too prosperous and too satisfied a religion to prevail in England now. It is a kind of Salvation Army for the well-to-do who suffer from nerves. I would not sneer at them or at the faith that cures them; but it is not and cannot be Catholic until it aims at working a change, not only on the inner minds of individuals, but on the whole order of society."

He closes with this: "The question remains, which no one yet can answer, whether any existing church has the energy to grasp it, to free itself from its own past, to proclaim the truth that Christianity is yet to be discovered by all the powers of man's mind, and to be practised by all the energy of his will. If not, we may dare to predict that a new ~~Church~~ Church will arise and destroy the old ones. But, in England, it certainly has not arisen yet."

While we know there are many in the world today who have not yet bowed the knee to Baal, and we expect them to join us in the closing work, yet we must be careful about taking these great men in with us. All great men are not wise, neither are all great men good men. We want to keep our eyes open to the great fact that the great men of this earth are set against God and His people. We expect antagonism and criticism and conflict right up to the very last, until the King of Peace comes.

I was reading the epistles of John again yesterday for my edification, and do you know that the 2d chapter shows a little intolerance? Truth is intolerant in a certain sense. That was what made our fathers great, because of their intolerance for anything but truth. In the 10th verse of 2 John, it says: "If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not

into your house," and I have written in the margin, "nor his books into your libraries." I think we can read that in without doing violence to the scripture.

Now concerning the 11th chapter of Daniel: The vision itself in the 11th of Daniel is one with the 10th chapter and one with the 12th chapter,--the prelude in the 10th, the conclusion in the 12th, and the body in the 11th. I am still studying this matter, with my mind open to receive further truth. I like that subtitle of Brother Smith's book, "the response of History to the voice of prophecy."

(Prof. Sorenson reading from paper and referring to outline on blackboard -- briefly referring to Sections 6 and 7.)

Section 3, Verses 38-39. The ruler of the French had always been styled since the baptism of Clovis the Oldest Son of the Church, and the nation had been called the Oldest Daughter of the Church, ^{All through} ~~introducing~~ the time when the winds of the Reformation were stirring over the lands of Europe and the light of God was breaking through, that privilege was denied poor France. The Huguenots were hunted like wild beasts of the mountains, that land that had always been watered by the blood of the Albigenses and the Waldensians. Francis 1st was the first in the days of the Reformation to turn his proud face from the oncoming light and to lend her influence to the influence of the Reformation light which serves as a social stabilizer in other lands. When at last the inefficiency of the Bourbon kings became intolerable, and the unfortunate land had reaped a rich harvest under the sowing of Louis 14 and 15, certain radical leaders among the ~~the~~ people assumed control of the Government and made a radical break with all except divine and social ties, the religion of God was rejected, and cast aside the Bible, the weekly cycle was changed, and the marriage institution was greatly weakened where it was not entirely dishonored.

(Elder Daniells then explains that Elder Tait had offered to give up the next study period to allow Professor Sorenson to finish his topic. This was agreed to, and Professor Sorenson continued.)

Now for an enlargement of one or two of the sections. I presume there will not be any questions arise on Sections 1,2,3,4,5. We will begin at Section 6, and I wish you would read with me from the Revised Version, Verse 14: "And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south; also the children of the violent among thy people shall lift themselves up to establish the vision; but they shall fall." Notice how it reads. It shows clearly that the preposition there is ~~xxx~~ genative and not dative. In this contest with the King of the South many of the violent of thy people shall join themselves to seek to establish the vision. Many of the militant Jews who had gone to service, or were forced by ----- King of the South, joined themselves to Antiochus the Great. The Jews suffered much persecution. Israel was placed on the highway of the nations for missionary endeavor, but when she lost her civilizing power, her power to civilize other nations, then her light went out, and she lost her power, and as the armies surged back and forth she became ground between the upper and the nether millstones. Then these militant Jews said that God has gone back on us, and it is a matter of the strongest nation, so they ceased to be noncombatants and took up arms. They failed to see God's purpose, they failed to study his plan, and they brought disaster to the cause of God.

PROF. ANDERSON: Gives the rendering of the 14th verse in the Jewish Bible: "And in those times shall many stand up against the King of the South, also children of the South, and shall lift themselves up to establish the vision."

PROF. LACY: Refers to the Latin Vulgate and the Septuagent -- "sons also the prevaricators of thy people," and "sons of the questionable ones of thy people." It was stated that this gave practically the same rendering, but that the matter could not be pressed too far in the original.

PROF. SHAW: Refers to Newton's translation as "the breakers of thy people," and to Spurrell's translation, "the violent opposers of thy people."

PROF. SORENSON: In the 18th verse, there we find distinctly a third power introduced. The king of the North and the King of the South had been antecedents of the pronoun down to this point, here we have a third power represented on his own behalf.

(SORENSEN--Cont'd)

LAWY: I do not think that refers to Rom.

SORENSEN: I do not know that we have any specific historical record where they did join.

(Verse 15) "So the king of the north shall come, and case up a mount, and take the most fenced cities; and the arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be any strength to withstand."

This refers to the Battle of Gaza, by which Antiochus came in full control of the affairs of the nations, in 198 B.C.

Then in the 16th verse we have the king of the south not getting along very well. He had trouble. "But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him." There was a peculiar hollowness in the Egyptian situation. It crumbled under Antiochus Magnus.

But Antiochus Magnus that came against Egypt "shall do according to his own will and none shall stand before him." By the victory of Gaza he became the arbiter of the Jews. But he did not destroy their service or temple. His successors afflicted the Jews very much afterward, but he simply had overwhelming power for the time being. He did not turn this power against the Jewish people. There is no connection between "destruction" and "standing in the land"

(Vs. 17): "He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him; " (under equitable conditions) as the margin says "and he shall give him the daughter of woman, corrupting (margin, to corrupt) her." This was after the Battle of S-----

when the Macedonians were defeated and Antiochus Magnus begins to wonder what was coming next; and he thinks the West is where the trouble is. So he forms a league with Ptolemy and gives his daughter in marriage. 220

PRESCOTT: Are you now dealing with Rome ~~xxx~~?

SORENSEN: No.

PRESCOTT: I thought you referred to the defeat of Rome

SORENSEN: I was referring to the history and the Scriptures. It is merely a connecting point leading to the 18th verse, So he gives his daughter Cleopatra to Ptolemy in marriage in the year 193 B. C.

Then in verse 18 we have here a third party introduced. There is no doubt about this.

18 Vs.: "After this he shall turn his face to the isles"-- Isles in this connection refers to the Coast lands (margin). And history records in that connection Antiochus Magnus was conqueror of all of Asia Minor to the Dardanelles. Those little cities had been friends of the Romans. Then he crossed the Aegean Sea and went into Greece. The Greeks were the allies of the Romans, and the Romans came to their assistance against him.

But a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him." ~~At~~ At the great Battle of Magnesia in 190 there was such an overwhelming defeat given Antiochus Magnus which brought about the utter collapse of Egypt. The government was all built on arbitrary despotism and there was no national feeling to rally the people behind the rulers. So it collapsed, and the heaviest indemnity was laid

upon it that was ever laid upon any ancient peoples—~~taxes~~ Antiochus Magnus was compelled to pay 3,000 talents at once and 1,000 a year for twelve years. It was a ~~hx~~ great defeat for him. He had all the trouble he wished for and "the reproach was turned on him. And to collect this tribute to pay his conquerors, it became necessary for him to rob the people, spoil their temples and resort to ever means fair and unfair to get this money. The temples were the depositaries of the people's money in those days, and these he spoiled. Finally he lost his life while robbing one temple in Asia Minor, and never returned to carry on his work.

Verse 20: "Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom; but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle." He had all he could do to collect the annual tribute. He levied a very heavy tribute on the Jews. In fact, he robbed their temple at Jerusalem and took their sacred treasures. He was very distinctly a "raiser of taxes" for Rome.

Now there are two points that should be noted in prophetic interpretation. One is that prophecy runs in successive line from the time it was uttered to the coming of Christ. That is the ordinary way of interpreting prophecy. Now the view that would introduce Rome as early as the 14th verse, would be what I should call in railroad terms a "switchback"—where the line runs ~~in~~ on a certain distance, and then turns back. That is a law of prophetic interpretation, when a line of historical consecutive prophecy is connected and goes in one straight line. In this case, there is a "switchback" between ~~the~~ Constantinople and Actium at B. C. 31, and running straight on down

This would presumably be a weakness in the interpretation.

The second reason is that the run of the standard version do not introduce a third outside party. This application is that it refers to the land and God's people who suffered persecution. In this case the Jews would of course not be the third party. Now if this third party is not introduced, this eliminates them at once in the general interpretation. It turns out to be a "switchback". I have come to look with favor on that way of viewing this prophecy, and the facts seem to fit in. In this connection it would be the successor of Antiochus Magnus, his son Seleucus, who robbed the temple of the Jews and was finally assassinated. He was the persecutor of the Jews. Of course this interpretation is all subject to a careful study of the Hebrew texts.

LACEY: You can not dogmatise all that?

SORENSEN: No. My main reason has been to build an outline of this great chapter. I consider this a very great chapter. You will agree with me in this one thing that the Spirit of Prophecy said about this 11th chapter of Daniel, that there were some things that were to be fulfilled here in our day. I think that is one of the glorious points. I do not think we are through with this chapter. This is one of the great chapters we will be able to help men to see the hand of God is in human history.

C M SORENSON

"That far-off divine event, to which the whole creation moves."

The second coming of the Lord is one of the great focal points of human history. There is a straight chain clear through to the last final and ultimate detail. That point is clear. My only endeavor in this has been to make the view more consistent with the general laws of prophetic interpretation. It does not lead to any different conception concerning it. Now we are ready for the last section.

C B HAYNES: Before you pass on. Did you not omit the 21st verse?

C M SORENSON: Yes, I did. Thank you. I might say a word regarding my personal experience as a teacher of history. I examined our history carefully. I find that history in the secular schools usually closes with the death of Alexander, and does not cover those events connected with his successors. But we as a people deal with prophecy. I found my co-laborers not very well versed in these periods. I was not well versed in them myself. I found that some references in our magazines and tracts did not correspond with the facts. The history of that period was not easily accessible, and the writer brought some a priori conclusions of his own. My classes do not close with 303, with the Death of Alexander. So far as God's great purpose for the salvation of man, God says a great deal about Selucius and the others. We have taken the book by M'Haffey, "Alexander's Empires." We also use "The House of Selucius" by Bevon, two volumes. We try to go into this a little more extensively than the secular schools. The fact is, we are not teaching civilization, we are teaching the exposition of prophecy. These are some of the

matters that have led me to search carefully to find a series of facts that dovetail into this situation, facts concerning those events after Alexander died, before the Romans came into power.

H C LACEY: The Biblical prophetic view is really Alexander and his successors.

C M SORENSON: All the great men of Greece's material glory, and her philosophers and her dramatists, are not mentioned in the Bible. The Bible begins with where Greece had reached her silver age, when the golden age had been passed, and she was passing into the silver age of the Hellenistic period, when she is unified for the first time. Out of turmoil came uniformity that led them against Persia. Persia could have been crippled long before, but no one worked together to accomplish that. I don't suppose God has necessarily set the bounds, that it might not have been done before.

"And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries."

The successor of Selucius was Antiochus Epiphanes, who obtained the kingdom by flattery while the real successor, the brother of Selucius, was a hostage in Rome. The kingdom of Syria had to send so many prominent men to Rome for three years as a pledge or tribute that they would behave themselves. The lawful successor was Demetrius. Antiochus Epiphanes had been at Rome, but his three years' term was up, and he was on furlough. He was a younger son of Antiochus Magnus. His nephew, the real successor, was hostage at that time, and by flattery he usurped the place of his nephew and became king. He was the

man that offered swine blood on the altar, and did everything that a wicked man can do. That is the only time when material harm is purposely brought on the Jews by the ruling powers. They used to have a lot of other trouble. At this time, however, Antiochus Epiphanes purposely brought deliberate trouble on the people of God.

In the 22nd verse Rome seems to be very clearly introduced. The general policy of Rome is introduced, without years and times, but for quite a season they were to exercise that power which they had gained in unscrupulous persecution of the people of God.

Next we come down to the Roman persecution. The Jews were scattered, and yet they received no more than their reward. The same people destroyed the Lord Jesus and placed him in a Roman tomb and guarded it by Roman soldiers.

W W PRESCOTT: Do you mean that the 22nd verse brings us to the crucifixion?

C M SORENSON: Yes.

A diplomatic agreement was made at Rome. They would make very fair promises and work deceitfully at times, and thus secure the dominion and swallow up one province after another.

W W PRESCOTT: You understand that the "overwhelming forces" in verse 22 and the "small people" of verse 23, refer to the same people?

SORENSON: Yes. From a small beginning the seven-hilled city grew into a vast empire.

W W PRESCOTT: It does not say "from a small people."

C M SORENSON: No, "With a small people." Those policies are described in the verses which tell of her manner of prosperity, in

verse 28, referring to the persecution of God's people and the holy government. In 112 was given a distinct imperial edict for systematic persecution. Pliny was told exactly what to do. They continued to exercise this policy of Rome toward Christianity. They had indignation against the holy government.

Verses 28 and 29: (29 only read) "At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter." Against Egypt, against all the forces of the South, there was no trouble by the vandal forces coming against him, therefore "he shall be grieved, and return." Rome is broken now by the barbarian hordes. They are against God's chosen people, but certain laws are favoring them, and these were passed and being passed constantly in connection with the downfall of the empire favoring the holy catholic church.

Then verse 31. "And forces shall stand on his part." That has reference to those who forsake the holy covenant. Official ecclesiasticism now develops and puts forth prerogatives, and those people go right on, and they are the forsakers of the holy covenant.

W WPRESCOTT: I understand then that between the 29th and 30th verses you change from imperial Rome to papal Rome?

C M SORENSON: Yes.

Then down to the 35th verse, the papacy is covered from 450 onward. Now the last part of this chapter --

W G WIRTH: May I ask what is that "coming to the south"?

C M SORENSON: The vandal tribes at the time appointed "shall return and come to the south." That is verse 29. Imperial Rome would have conflict again with the south in 31 B. C., and

now there is no more conflict mentioned by the south until this time.

A.G.DANIELLS: This afternoon we take up the discussion of Brother Prescott's study this morning, and then the discussion of this subject. I wish we had more blackboard space. It seems to me we ought to go into the most thorough study possible of this chapter now, and we ought to reach pretty definite conclusions regarding every verse, if possible, and certainly every division. I would be very glad to have the whole outline right through from verse 1, and see just how we stand on our teaching; and then if we could have references to the history upon which we base the interpretation of the view we hold regarding this. We must have the points of agreement, and not go away with a whole great period of time on which we say we agree but on which we do not have the outline upon which we agree. We want it for future use. What we all want here is to come out right and then stay right. We do not want to do a great grasshopper jump over anything. We want to land right because we have traveled right. I want a verse rightly interpreted,--then I take it.

E.R.PALMER: I presume it would be imposing too much on the brethren who are presenting this subject, but it seems to me we are clear as to the starting and closing points, and I wish we might have a paraphrase of that chapter as we understand it, with the dates written in, so that we could follow through more easily.

H.C.LACEY: I have a paraphrase right here in my notes.

SESSION OF BIBLE CONFERENCE

223

3 P. M.

Elder E. R. Palmer offered prayer.

ELD. DANIELLS:--Now we are all exceedingly anxious to get on solid rock and stay there in the exposition of this line of prophecy. I know we want to begin at the beginning of it and we want to stay on safe ground clear to the close of it.

W.W.PRESCOTT:--Is this the question for the first hour?

A.C.DANIELLS:--No, I beg pardon, but I will finish my statement and then I won't have to repeat it.

Now the question is arising whether we will do better to take up the discussion this afternoon and ask questions on ground that has been partially covered, or whether it would be better to follow the line of exposition and statement through to the end by both speakers to get the complete view before us and then go into the discussion of it. If the speakers are to go on this afternoon, they ought to know it even now, so that if they have any papers or things they have not with them, they can get them together and get their minds in shape. What is the wish of the Council?

C.P.BOLLMAN:--I move that we allow the speakers to develop the subject before discussing it.

Motion seconded.

A.C.DANIELLS:--It is moved and seconded that both speakers shall complete their outlines which they have to make before we enter into discussion. Do you all favor that? All who do, signify it by raising the hand. All are in favor of it so we will do that way. Then when the time does come, let us ask

only such questions as are necessary to get the clear understanding of what is being presented. Not to question or discuss the thing, but if there is a point not clear and we want them to restate it or give any reference or proof, but the rest we will leave until they have finished.

In Daniel 3 and 7, and in fact all the way along, we feel that we understand the line of prophecy so well that we can just about write a little paragraph of history or attach a little paragraph already written by somebody to the verse and have the fulfillment before us. It seems to me the eleventh chapter ought to be about as clear as that. There is the prophetic statement; here is the historical fact and the statement someone has written down about it right there. I think we should be able to go clear through without any speculative part left but or any uncertainty. We should carry it clear through to the last verse.

Now we will take up the discussion of the morning's study. Here is a chance to enlarge, Brother Bollman, on the thought you had up this morning if you wish. It is open for questions or remarks.

M.C. WILCOX:--There is one statement Brother Prescott made Friday, or Thursday, that I certainly do not wish to misunderstand, and it is a question whether he meant to be understood in the way the statement seemed to indicate. It is whether while Christ was on earth, he preached Himself, or was it really after all the one thing he did not do,--preach himself. Did He eliminate himself entirely, and represent the Father?

W.W.PRESCOTT:--I would not have it understood to the contrary. When I said Christ preached himself, I meant he preached himself as the revealer of God.

G.B.THOMPSON:--I understood you to say this morning that all truth is personality. I cannot understand the personality of God and Christ, and also of angels and human beings, but I find myself unable to understand that all truth is personality. Is sunshine a personality? If so, in what sense?

W.W.PRESCOTT:--I distinguished between what the Scripture says is truth, and a statement of fact. Sunshine is a fact, but Christ in the scriptures is truth. When Christ says "I am the truth, He covers the whole field of truth as far as the Biblical revelation is concerned, and in Him, truth becomes a personality. We cannot understand the things that are revealed as abstractions. If we are to deal with these things intelligently, we must grasp them in a form in which we can lay hold on them. Any reference to truth as it is in Jesus, and that is the expression in the Scripture, has this meaning. As it is in Jesus it becomes personality. Our only comprehension of truth is as revealed in Christ,--truth in the sense of that which is real; reality as opposed to mere semblance or appearance.

J.L.SHAW:--You would not mean scientific truth, then, but Biblical truth?

W.W.PRESCOTT:--Yes, scientific facts enable us to understand biblical truth. There is a great difference between them.

M.C.WILCOX:--Fact, is cold and dead; truth is living.

T.E.BOWEN:--Going back to Thursday, I should say, Brother Prescott, in speaking of the cycle of eternity, which none of us, I think, can fully comprehend, meaning the eternity that was before the world was and on the other side, representing it as you did by a little ruler that you had. Now the question in my mind was this: It seems to me that we are getting into deep water there and we better not speak of it in just that way. The point with me was this: How is it that just as soon as you can locate an event anywhere in the line of eternity, it ceases to be eternity? This thought has been brought out here.

Going back, for instance, to the place where Christ had a beginning, if we can comprehend such a fact which is brought out in the Scriptures, it would cease to be eternity. I cannot quite comprehend that. I want to know if Brother Prescott thinks eternity is set aside at that time? It seems to me that it is all eternity, and the experience of this world is a part of eternity as much as time will make up eternity after the history of this world is made up. I think that now time is making up eternity just as much as it did before the history of this world began.

W.W.PRESCOTT:--Perhaps it would help me to explain if Brother Bowen would tell us where in the Scriptures it is taught that Christ has a beginning.

T.E.BOWEN:--That will bring up another question I could not understand, brought out by Brother Lacey. I cannot understand any expression saying Christ the son has come forth and is no part of the Father. It seems to me, brethren, when we get there we are getting back where the Lord has not revealed and it is right here in "Early Writings" that God has called

that a mystery and not revealed, but it was revealed to the angels in heaven that the Son was to be worshipped, and when He was brought into the world it calls Him the only begotten Son, and that is the point. He is spoken of in the Bible as the only begotten son.

W.W. PRESCOTT:--But where does it touch the time of his beginning? I understood you to say the Scriptures teach that He had a beginning.

BOWEN:-- Don't they speak of His being the only begotten son?

PRESCOTT:--Certainly. Is that all you mean by that? That does not fix any beginning.

BOWEN:--I do not pretend to say I know, and I don't think any of us know, and I think that is the point: We ought to stop and not try to go back of it and go where angels do not go.

PRESCOTT:--I do not know, Brother Chairman, that I can exactly handle the point raised; I don't know that I fully understand it but I will try.

First, as to this statement that when we fix a point in eternity, we bring it into time.

BOWEN:--And time is no part of eternity.

PRESCOTT: No, I do not intend to convey that idea. When I tried to illustrate that, I meant that time is a mere section of eternity, past and future, but that of course it is all one eternity including the present. But this part is what we as finite minds can grapple with and deal with. It is a little section that we deal with as time. It can be measured as days, months, and years. Eternity cannot be measured that way.

BOWEN: That is the point. I cannot understand that eternity is not made up in measuring time. I believe eternity is made up of time as we measure it now. This present minute is this present minute in heaven. The moment Daniel began to pray, heaven knew and before he was through his prayer the angel was here. It seems to me that eternity is made up of time as we measure it and that it will go on as through all eternity and it will be made up of the cycle of time as we understand it.

H.C.LACEY: As I understand it, God is omnipresent everywhere at the same time, and I have always understood that he is eternal at the same time. While our finite minds cannot grasp it, the Lord is just as truly present in the infinite eons yet to come to us. He exists in the future just as truly as he does today. To bring that within the scope of the human mind is impossible. He is just as truly existing in the millions of years yet to come to us as he has been in the millions of years in the past.

I wish we might have had that question answered. It was this, as to whether there was ever a time when Jesus was not, or when Michael, as he was called, was not. I think the Bible teaches that we are to answer that question with an ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ emphatic negative. There never was a time when the Son was not. If the word Son puzzles us, let us remember that that is God's own sacred word to present His love for that second person of the deity. We are to know God as his father and our father. Jesus is the revelation. He is the Son of God, not meaning that he proceeded forth and developed from him, nor is there another mother,--I cannot help being precise, His existence spans eternity, and we cannot settle upon any point in eternity past when he began any more than we can settle upon any point in the future when he will not be.

"In the beginning was the Word." There are two Greek words used in that phrase. All things became by him. The Greek word that means to come into ~~being~~ being is _____. It says He became man. That was the incarnation. When we raise the question of the origin of the Son, we say there is no origin to Him. He is the second person of the Godhead.

L.L.CAVINESS: I missed a good deal of this discussion, and I do not know whether the idea is that we are to accept the so-called

Trinitarian doctrine or not. Personally, I have not been able to accept the so-called Trinitarian doctrine, that is, as generally presented, that there are three persons in the Godhead, and that there always were three. If that is the doctrine, I can not quite agree with it, because I was reading in the Bible yesterday, in the book of John, which is the book which reveals to us the deity of Christ, and I read as far as I could everything that Christ said concerning himself. Without contradicting what he said about himself, I cannot agree with the same doctrine. As I understand it, his statement of the deity rests upon his Sonship, and I do not think there is any one thing through the book of John that is more constantly referred to than the Sonship. I cannot believe that the two persons of the Godhead are equal, the Father and the Son,--that one is the Father and the other the Son, and that they might be just as well the other way around.

There is another statement he makes. He says that the Father, who has life in himself, gave the Son to have life in himself. When that took place, I do not know, but I believe it took place somewhere away back in eternity. I have to take Christ's word for it, that at some time that was true, that the Father had life in himself, and gave the Son to have life in himself.

There is also that other statement, that he had received glory from his Father. In praying he said it was his wish that the disciples might see the glory which he had with the Father, and which the Father had given him. It was not something he had all through eternity, but the Father had some time given to him the Glory of God. He is divine, but he is the divine Son. I cannot explain further than that, but I cannot ~~xxxxxxx~~ believe the so-called Trinitarian doctrine of the three persons always existing.

Elder Daniells here made some suggestions as to the delegates not becoming uneasy because we are studying a subject that we cannot comprehend. He asked that these be not transcribed.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I shall be exceedingly sorry if any expressions that I have used shall turn our minds away from the vital truth that I tried to deal with. A mere discussion of terms to settle a theological question is not my point. My point is to strike the vital things of the gospel. When the spirit of prophecy used the expression, third person of the Godhead, I would think there were two others. When expressions the same as are used in the spirit of prophecy are challenged as being unsuitable to use in the discussion, I may have to refer to the terms that are actually used in the spirit of prophecy in dealing with this matter. I deal with it because it has brought great personal blessing to me, and has given me a view of the gospel that I never had before, and not because I am trying to establish a theory of Trinitarianism, Unitarianism, or any otherism. I was in the same place that Brother Daniells was, and was taught the same things [that Christ was the beginning of God's creative work, that to speak of the third person of the Godhead or of the trinity was heretical] by authority, and without doing my own thinking or studying I supposed it was right. But I found out something different. It is because this study of the Scriptures in this way has brought great help and courage to me that I have presented it. It has brought me a view of God's eternal purpose.

Another thing that occurs to me is that when we read the Bible we have to take the meaning that the Spirit has put into it, and not the meaning that we put into it. That will make quite a difference in our reading. We do not always see in Christ's words what the

Spirit sees in them, and tells us afterwards. You following up certain teachings of the scripture that are merely hinted at or implied in Christ's words, and find that fully developed later.

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ When the Apostle Paul came to talk to the Colossians who had fallen into a heresy over the question of the origin of things, he pointed out that all things had their origin in him. In him were all things created. In him all things existed or held together. The continuance of all created things is conditioned upon his continued existence. Then he goes on and says, "In him are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden away." That thought Christ suggested: "I am the truth." Then he goes on and says further, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead." I do not see how we can get much farther than that in the study of the deity. That was implied in Christ's own teaching, but he did not use those terms. His teaching was developed for us so that we could understand. "IN him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead." I do not see how we can ~~get~~ find any stronger assertion of deity than in that statement. I think it is all taught in the gospel of John; but there is more meaning in these terms when they are applied to God and to Christ than we are able to put into them ourselves.

(PRESCOTT--Cont'd)

There must be opened to us by the Spirit, either in the Scriptures or by illumination that will impart to us something of the great meaning that is found in the simple terms in these scriptures.

Now I would like to have the whole matter turn over the question of some terms use or whether we are seeking to establish a certain doctrine. My desire is that we shall have a clear comprehension just so far as it is possible for finite minds to comprehend the wonderful truths of the gospel--the good news concerning his Son. As we go on in the study I shall hope to call attention very definitely as to how much is involved in this good news in order that we may more fully comprehend the greatness of the salvation brought to us and the wonderful basis for absolute confidence--absolute certainty concerning this gospel.

When one enters into that experience he will be able to teach that with the accompanying Spirit that will convince others of the certainty of it. While it will not be so much logical demonstration as conviction that goes with the assertion of truth by one who knows the truth. I think if we could ~~study~~ study into that experience we would see much more results from our teaching than by merely appealing to the intellect.

Now the living Word will speak to the heart as well as to the intellect, but if we stop with the intellect we shall fail of being able to grasp these truths. I would like to emphasize again this thought that I hope that the use of some terms will not lead us away from the vital thing. I had in mind in

bringing in this matter to show the absolute foundation of the gospel--the good news concerning his Son, so that we may be able for ourselves personally, without regard to anyone else--get more out of the gospel than we have so far.

WILCOX: We all believe the deity of Christ. It is not a question as to his deity or non-deity. In all this discussion there is no question regarding this.

WAKEHAM: Would you consider the denial of the co-eternity of the Father and Son was a denial of that deity?

PRESCOTT: That is the point I was going to raise: Can we believe in the deity of Christ without believing in the eternity of Christ?

BOLLMAN: I have done it for years.

PRESCOTT: That is my very point--that we have used terms in that accommodating sense that are not really in harmony with the Scriptural teaching. We believed a long time that Christ was a created being, in spite of what the Scripture says. I say this, that passing over the experience I have passed over myself in this matter--this accommodating use of terms which makes the Deity without eternity, is not my conception now of the gospel of Christ. I think it falls short of the whole idea expressed in the Scriptures, and leaves us not with the kind of a Saviour I believe in now, but a sort of human view--a semi-human being. As I view it, the deity involves eternity. The very expression involves it. You cannot read the Scripture and have the idea of deity without eternity.

KNOX: I believe all the statements that were made this morning by Elder prescott concerning the promises that are

given to us through Jesus Christ--that is, the many Scriptures²⁴¹ that were read; and I believe they are made sure to us because they are bound up in the Deity of Jesus Christ. I think that we are all agreed in the deity of the Son of God (Amen).

I think also that we ought to remember what Brother Daniells reminded us of this morning, that we cannot by searching find out God--that this is a matter --a subject that will be unfolding all through the days of eternity. And yet I do believe that the Word has given us glimpses in his Word, which he has intentionally placed there, to draw our minds out into the contemplation of truths concerning God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost.

Now I can not but believe as Brother Prescott has said, the Deity must be eternal. But the difficulty with me is that I can not believe that the deity of the Son as a separate existence is eternal. I believe in the trinity of God, and I believe that Jesus is God. It says, "Unto us a son is born?" and then you remember the names by which he is called--the Everlasting Father--the Prince of Peace--in Isaiah. The same Scripture speaks of him as the Son and as the Everlasting Father.

You remember the Word says that "in the beginning was the Word." Now that has been spoken a number of times, and by it we are carried back through eternity. But the same words are used exactly concerning the existence of matter. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. Now some time God called the things that we see out of the things that did not appear. I do not suppose there is one here that will contend the co-existence of matter with out God. Matter has been called into existence by God; but it was called into existence

"in the beginning," and "in the beginning" was the Word. Now the Word was the agency God used to call matter into existence, for "by him were all things made that were made."

242

Now again the servant of God speaks of the Son as the first created being. I never saw that, and never believed that, but it speaks of him as having sprung from the bosom of the Father. Now the Word also speaks of Levi paying tithes while he was in the loins of Abraham. Now it would have been equally true if the Lord's Spirit had carried the acts of Levi back to the time when he was in the loins of Adam. From God's viewpoint Levi had existed in the loins of his forefathers from the very beginning of time, but he did not have a separate existence until he was born.

and so Christ, ~~was~~ was with the Father, and of the Father--and the Father--from eternity; and there came a time--in a way we cannot comprehend nor the time that we cannot comprehend, when by God's mysterious operation the Son sprung from the bosom of his Father and had a separate existence.

PRESCOTT: I would like to call Brother Knox's attention to this, and ask how on that basis he would deal with John 8:58 "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was born I am." What does "I am" as to our conception of time, mean?

KNOX: His personal existence. I believe in the eternity of Jesus Christ. I cannot grasp the eternity of his separate and distinct existence.

TAIT: I feel we are discussing something we ought to wait sixty billion years before we start in on. Some of these scriptures do not mean to me what the brethren say they mean

to them. But now I think if we still get hold of Christ 243
and what he is to us now and what he will be to us who will reign
with him in glory we will go ~~ask~~ a long ways. Now I am
willing to wait to found out a lot of things I do not understand
now, until I get on the other side.

A G DANIELLS: Now we shall have to change the order. We don't want to keep on and go too far in fine distinctions. But I don't think I can altogether with Brother Tait. I have enjoyed these discussions. They have been helpful to me. I am glad for them.

H C LACEY: Is it necessary, in order to have a heart apprehension of a Bible truth, that our minds should have a clean-cut apprehension of it. Are we not to understand the theory within the mind as well as with the heart? I have enjoyed these discussions, and I think the Bible has given us enough to answer that question. I didn't see it myself, years ago. But now I think I can see how Jesus can be the eternal son.

M C WILCOX: Doesn't the heart sometimes apprehend what the mind cannot comprehend?

A G DANIELLS: So far as I am concerned, I went along with a mystified idea quite a while, and the thing that began to knock the scales from my eyes was when the Desire of Ages came out. I was in Australia when the page proofs were brought out. I never believed some other things till the Testimonies came out and set me thinking. And I said, Look here, Sister White has always been in harmony with the Bible, now she has dropped a stitch somewhere or else I am wrong. I went to studying, and that did more for me.

Perhaps we have discussed this as long as we need to. We are not going to take a vote on trinitarianism or arianism, but we can think. Let us go on with the study.

W T KNOX: Does the discussion, so far as it has gone, involve the question of trinitarianism or arianism? I can't see that it

does.

W W. PRESCOTT: Some things have been said this afternoon which I think a word will just help the whole thing. I referred to this scripture: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." I also referred to other scriptures of the same character in my studies. Perhaps some will remember, and brought out the point that Christ's attributes, what he was, was subordinate to the Father in this sense, that it was derived from the Father, but not that it was any less. The same glory, the same power, that the Father had. But you can't put those things to cold reasoning after our manner of dealing with such things, and say that the one who derived is just as great as the one from whom he derived it.

JOHN ISAAC?: What are we Bible teachers going to do? We have heard ministers talk one way. Our students have had Bible teachers in one school spend days and days upon this question, then they come to another school, and the other teacher does not agree with that. We ought to have something definite so that we might give the answer. I think it can be done. We ought to have it clearly stated. Was Christ ever begotten, or not, or this thing, or that thing.

A G DANIELLS: Perhaps in another study we might have a study on the word begotten. I thought this morning when Brother Bollman spoke of it, if we could have five or ten minutes on that word, bring in the law of precise meaning in that interpretation, it would be well. But we shall have to drop it here this time. Now we will go on. Now let's not get a bit nervous nor scared.

Don't let the conservatives think that something is going to happen, and the progressives get alarmed for fear it won't happen. Let's keep up this good spirit. Bring out what you have. Let us get all the light we have, believe what we can, and let the rest go. I don't want to believe or be called upon to believe what I don't believe, nor call upon anyone else to believe what I believe if he can't. But let us press right toward the ~~in-~~enlarged vision, the broader conception. While we will never apprehend comprehend it all, let's get as near to it as we can.

E R PALMER: Are not these studies on the sonship to be continued, and the discussions to be continued?

A G DANIELLS: Yes. Brother Prescott continues his studies. And here are all our other studies written out verbatim. They look mighty good.

CHAS. THOMPSON: There's another thing, we are going to get into, I'm afraid. People keep coming in late, they don't know what has gone before, and it will all have to be gone over again.

A G DANIELLS: We will ask Brother Sorenson to proceed. We decided to devote the two hours now to this subject, or until he and Brother Lacey have completed their thought. ~~Wxx~~ So we would like to have you travel right along your road without backing up and going over too much, or being switched by questions.

[C. M. SORENSON then took the floor, but the first part of his presentation was not reported, by direction of Chairman A.G.Daniells]

W.W.PRESCOTT: Would you fix a date when Turkey, ^{or the Saracens} became the king of the north? 247

C.M.SORENSEN: 1798.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Would you fix a date when Rome ceased to be the king of the north and the Saracens became king of the north?

C.M.SORENSEN: When Rome ceased to be, 638 A. D. That is when the Saracens became the occupants of this section, and then the Seleucan Turks became the occupants of it about 900, when they crowded out the Saracens. It was the same religion they stood for, and the chief ruler of the state was the head of the religious activities; in other words, the sultan was the caliph, and the caliph was the sultan.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I was hoping you would give your historical data. C.M.SORENSEN: First it was the Saracens, then the Seleucan Turks, and later the Ottoman Turks came in. They have occupied that territory until General Allenby crowded them out of so much of it.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Do you connect that with any particular verse of Daniel?

C.M.SORENSEN: Yes, in connection with verse 40. The poor Napoleon was defeated by this power, and left his army in the lurch to be taken charge of by other powers. It never did reach France except as the men drifted home one by one. That conflict was in 1798, and that ~~mark~~ would rather indicate the time of the end in 1798. They took charge of Palestine, and did not lose Egypt until this present war. The Turk still exists in these regions, but what the Peace Conference may do, we do not know. But when his place is given to someone else, if it is before the end of time, whoever is there would become the king of the north.

C.P.BOLLMAN: Is that territory still under Turkish rule?

C.M.SORENSEN: A portion of it is. I do not know just how much is left. But the scripture says he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. Here we have an interesting map of Europe in 1740. Everything colored yellow is Turkey. Here in this other map we come to a time when his territory was rapidly being diminished, and if it had not been for the fact that other nations have not been able to agree about the spils, and who should occupy the territory he has occupied, he would have come to his end before this. But God, in his providence, ~~and~~ has kept him from coming to his end.

Before he comes to his end, he will plant the tabernacle of his palace between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain.

Greece was lost to Turkey in 1830, and then there were other portions lost little by little. Roumania became independent in 1878; Bosnia was lost in 1878, and also Serbia; and here we have another large portion taken from it in 1913, and this (pointing) is all that was left when the European war broke out in 1914.

The Turk has been bolstered up by many different powers who have never had any real interest in his permanency. But there comes a time when he will plant the tabernacle of his palace between the holy mountain and the seas, and at that time shall Michael stand up. That, briefly, is a survey of the Eastern Question as it appears to me.

Here is something I have just copied from the Review and Expositor for April; Dr. David Foster Estes, of Colgate University, in an article entitled, "What are We to Teach about the Return of Christ," says: "Peculiarly strong emphasis on the return of Jesus and the associated events is no part of faith and duty." He says

that a good deal of what is said about the coming of Christ is largely a misunderstanding of the Scriptures. He also said, ^{that} "There is no agreement as to the historical events that fulfill the specifications of prophecy. He continues: "There is another demonstration quite as striking and to the writer absolutely conclusive is found in the recognizable momentous events of history, no hint of which is found in any accepted interpretation of prophecy. Take, for example, the rise of Islam, drawing away by conquest a large part of the world where Christianity had been spread, and for centuries imperiling, so far as men could see, the very existence of Christianity, as well as of civilization, all of which finds no acknowledged forecast."

Then he tells why he cannot accept the currently accepted views of prophecy,--because there is no agreement as to what historical events fulfil the scriptures.

This man says that any interpretation of prophecy as a system, that leaves out the Turkish question, that leaves out the question of Mohammedanism, which is such a great menace, can scarcely be a true program of a continuous series of predictions covering the history of mankind. We, as a people, have a consistent view of that menace. Evidently he is not well read on our interpretation of prophecy. These things are found in the book of Revelation. And if they are a suitable subject of prophecy in the Revelation, why might they not also be a suitable subject of prophecy in the book of Daniel? The prophecies of Daniel are very often paralleled by the prophecies of Revelation. Revelation is, to a large extent, a beautiful mosaic made up of the beautiful figures and symbolic representations used throughout the Bible up to the writer's time.

He certainly deals with the rise and progress of Islam as a sign of the times. It seems to fit into the book of Daniel.

Now a word or two about the values of this subject: The preaching of this subject in the fear of God, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, has done a great deal of good in days past. It has brought a great many men and women to a conscious realization that God lives and moves, and that human affairs are subject to God's overruling providence. Those values are still in that mode of presentation.

A second value is that it is a clear-cut view, or at least it appears so to me. It accounts for every year of time from the days of the prophet in a straight, continuous line down to the consummation of all things. Even if it does not appear to some to be clear and consistent, it certainly is joined chronologically from the day it was uttered to the day of the Lord's second coming. It is geographically tangible. You can put your finger on the actual nations that have lived and moved and passed into oblivion. There is both chronological and geographical unity in this prophecy.

(SORENSEN--Cont'd)

Surely the great needs of mankind that have been satisfied in the preaching of this chapter in years past, in the light of Jesus--that need in a magnified sense is in the world today. Men today are more hungry for the things we can preach from this chapter than ever before. And that is the great value of it I wish to call attention to.

I have this book written by Professor Fullerton, called "Prophecy and Authority," to which Professor Prescott referred the other day--a book against the blessed hope of the second coming of Christ and the certainty of prophecy. It is not as radical as Shaler Matthews --not quite as anti-Christian, but still it is pagan and materialistic in its entire presentation. On page 200 he ~~says~~ points out, quoting from William Miller;

"There is a final interest which the denial of predictive prophecy immediately affects and that is the Millennial hope. By this hope is not meant the expectation already referred to that the kingdoms of this world are finally to become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, that we are to look for a spiritual consummation of this world order which will be satisfying to the moral ~~wor~~ demands of the conscience of the race. But by the Millennial hope is meant an expectation of a particular way in which this consummation is to take place."--

I am glad we have a hope that has a particular way of making known when the consummation is nigh so that we may lift up our heads and rejoice. I don't think that is anything against it all. He goes on:

"---"the setting up of an earthly kingdom and the reign of Christ for a thousand years, with various accompanying signs and wonders in heaven above and the earth beneath and in the waters under the earth. The denial of predictive prophecy effectually vetoes such expectations."

He says the best way to meet Adventists is to say that prophecy was not intended to deal with the future. That would meet it, but it would leave men with their lights put out.

---"William Miller, the founder of the famous Millerite movement, in his original essay, published in 1835, makes the following significant argument: 'At [Christ's] advent his forerunner was spoken of ---"One crying in the wilderness"---the manner of his birth---a child born of a Virgin---the place where---Bethlehem---the time of his death---seventy weeks---the star that appeared, the stripes he received, the miracles he performed, the taunting of his foes, all was literally fulfilled. Then why not suppose that all the prophecies concerning his second appearance will be as literally accomplished as the former? Can any one show a single reason why not?'. . . . In this paragraph Miller, though probably quite unconsciously, repeats the argument of Justin Martyr which we have quoted above (p. 19). In it we have the justification of the Millennialist interpretation of Scripture. Its premises are an inerrant Bible and the fact of predictive prophecy. If the prophecies of the First Advent were as literally fulfilled as has always been claimed, the attempts of these students of Scripture to unlock the remaining enigmas that must refer to the Second Advent, because not yet fulfilled, must be recognized as legitimate. There can be no

such thing in an errorless Scripture as an unfulfilled prediction. All those, therefore, who share with the Millennialists their two premises of an inerrant Scripture and the predictive theory of prophecy, are precluded in principle from criticizing the Millennialist position."

I hope we have a lot of people on that solid platform. That does not mean that any other view than what has been here outlined would be all at fault on these two great fundamental principles.

I leave this subject with you as a fellow student of the Word of God--pointing out in these scattering remarks the value that to my mind still inheres in this particular way of explanation of the 11th chapter of Daniel--of the Eastern Question in the fulfillment of prophecy. We have two mighty pillars of strong conviction in an infallible Bible and the principle of predictive prophecy, and holding these two great anchors of the souls, the Lord will lead us on step by step, and what further we need to know about the situation, will be revealed to us in His own good time by his own good providence.

And when we speak about future prophecy, we must speak a bit guardedly. I am not able to speak with as much convincing sureness about when "he will plant the tabernacles of his palace," etc., as I can of the fact that his territory [the Turk's] has been gradually consuming away--that he has been receiving some help, ^{from time to time} but this assistance has been taken away. To my mind he has reached that time when there will no longer any help be given him. From what I learn of the intentions of the peace league of nations there is no power that is friendly to him. The best information I am able to gather

it seems to indicate that there will still be a Turkish state left in Asia Minor.

(Elder Lacey's Presentation.)

LACEY:

Now before taking up this study in detail, there are three or four propositions which bear upon the question decisively.

There are four lines of prophesy found in the Book of Daniel and may be considered part of this Eastern Question although the climax involves the Papacy meeting its end in connection with Jerusalem rather than the Turk.

The second proposition is, the characteristic of this study--this line of prophecy--diverse from all others in that it is couched in almost wholly literal language, involving some of the minutest events of personal experience. We see that in our accepted view, of the first few verses. And it ends with events that are now--in 1919--trembling on the verge of fulfillment.

Third, The problem--The problem presented in this chapter--and to this I would invite very careful attention. Our current view of this prophecy from verse four and onward was very materially crystallized by Elder Uriah Smith before other leading brethren had agreed as to the day of beginning.

H C LACEY: If I am incorrect in any statement, I would like correction. Our current interpretation and the acceptance of Thoughts on Daniel and Revelation as our standard authority, has caused for years independent study and presentation of the study. For 30 years now or more there has been a growing dissatisfaction with the current view, based upon the manifest inaccuracies of the earlier presentation, historical and philological. And a new view, adhering more faithfully to the original text, and in closer harmony with historical facts, has been advocated.

Elder William Miller had a view of Daniel 11. I have his lectures that he used to deliver, up to 1842, and he brings into the purview of this prophecy Napoleon Bonaparte, and he has something for every specification in those closing verses. He held that when he planted the tabernacle of his palace between the seas was when Napoleon Bonaparte was at Milan, Italy. He came to his end and none helped him when the British took him prisoner and sent him to St. Helena. That is the end of the prophecy, and Brother Miller pointed out the singular accuracy with which those events were fulfilled, and he laid a great deal of stress on that prophecy, believing, of course, that Jesus was coming in 1844. It was natural for him to find events that he could apply. Now, if I understand it, when our people had to recede from Brother Miller's position, then they studied these last verses; and right there comes this point, that before all had decided -- Elders Waggoner, White, and Butler -- before there had been a full decision, Elder Uriah Smith was writing his book, and he, believing that the papacy would not be restored, he felt like following some other prophetic interpretation, and brought in France and Turkey, and the

thing was -- shall I say -- foisted out upon our people, with the best of intentions, of course. We are the descendants of those who have accepted this interpretation without question. We revered Thoughts on Daniel, and read it earnestly. I used to sit up till midnight reading it, until I had some chapters almost by heart. We all respect Brother Smith highly. Personally I do. He was one of the giants of this denomination. One of the brightest remembrances of my stay in Battle Creek is in connection with Brother Smith. I used to be invited to his home. I went and helped him on Sunday night. Our associations were personal and friendly, and I look back with great pleasure upon them. But there are some things that we have had to change a little bit. I believe that the history of Brother Smith's interpretation is that he crystallized the thing at a little early date, and discounted the restoration of the papacy, and brought in these other powers, France and Turkey, and so we have his interpretation.

The verses that he switched off to France, those verses are quoted in Second Thessalonians, and our interpretation of Second Thessalonians is that it is the papacy. Yst when we go back to Daniel 11 we say it is France. Just a little inconsistency there. That is the problem, as I understand it. There was a premature crystallizing of the interpretation of this prophecy, and hence there has been a dissatisfaction with the interpretation of these specifications.

Another point. The Spirit of Prophecy is absolutely silent as to the interpretation of the details of this prophecy. Daniel 11 is nowhere quoted in Sister White's writings. To me that is a significant fact. She has never authorized by any published word

the current interpretation of Daniel 11. In Volume 9 she says "The prophecy of Daniel 11 has nearly reached its complete fulfillment." It looks to me as if the field is open. I have adopted this principle of interpretation: When Sister White has put an interpretation upon a passage, that is the primary interpretation, and I am glad to accept it. If we can decide either way, and Sister White has something to say, that settles it. What she says about the Daily has to be looked at carefully, but with that understanding. Now the Spirit of Prophecy is absolutely silent in its interpretation of the details of this prophecy. She speaks of Turkey, but quoted Revelation 9 and Revelation 16 only. She speaks of France, and Revelation 11 is quoted.

Everything we are teaching regarding the downfall of the Turkish empire, the expulsion of the Turk from Constantinople, may be presented from the text in Revelation 19 and Revelation 16:12-16, in which passage the Ottoman empire is indisputably brought to view. We don't lose anything by this new view. The drying up of the Turkish empire can be presented in the drying up of the River Euphrates just as truly as "He shall come to his end, and none shall help him." And so I have felt free to look at these verses and see what this new view is, because we are losing nothing, and on the other hand here is something, here are some present developments in the Near East which seem to be in harmony with the new view. They may introduce just a little different phase into the restoration of the papacy in the last days which will be fulfilled, and for which we shall need a prophetic presentation, but we shall find it in Daniel 11.

The harmony of the lines of prophecy in Daniel accord to the new view. There is one of the laws of interpretation that we haven't noted, and that is the law of internal harmony. May I state what I mean. The book of Daniel comprises four lines of prophecy of the fourteen in the Bible: Daniel 2, 7, 8&9, 10-12. Daniel 2 begins with Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, Rome, the suggested ten-fold division, the end. Daniel 7 covers exactly that same ground. It goes back to Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, Rome, brings out a little more clearly the ten kingdoms, and then emphasizes the papacy. Among those ten divisions emerges the papacy. Those two are companion prophecies. Daniel 2 covers the ground, Daniel 7 covers the same ground, with emphasis on the papacy. Daniel 8 and 9 begins with Medo-Persia and presents Greece, Rome pagan and Rome papal in one symbol. The last verses expatiate on the work of the papacy.

A G DANIELLS: In what way does that differ from Daniel 7?

H C LACEY: Not much. Just a little more about papal Rome. Daniel 8 and 9 is Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome pagan and papal. Daniel 10-12 goes back to Medo-Persia, Grecia, Rome, emphasizing the papacy. In the new view, instead of applying these verses to France and Turkey, apply them to the papacy. Now on the board I have placed this outline as we have it in this new view.

[Outline follows]