

OUTLINE OF SUGGESTED VIEW OF DANIEL 11

1. I. Medo-Persia. V. 12
 Cambyses, 529-522 B. C.
2. Smerides, 522-521 B. C.
 Darius Hystoapes, 485-465 B.C.
- II. Greece. v. 3-30
- 3 Alexander the Great, 336-323 B.C.
- 4 Cassander, Lysimmichus, Ptolemy, Seleucus, B.C. 301. Battle of Ipsus.
- 5 Ptolemy Lagus, 323
 Seleucus Nicator, 312
- 6 Ptolemy Philadelphus, Antiochus Theus, Berenice. B. C. 289
- 7-9 Ptolemy Euérgetes, Ptolemy Callinicus, B. C. 246
- 10-19 Antiochus Magnus
- 20 Seleucus Philopater, B. C. 187-176
- 21-30 Antiochus Ephphanes, 176-164
- 30-45 III. Rome Pagan and Papal v. 30-45
- 31 Destruction of Jewish Temple, A. D. 70
 Taking away daily, A. D. 503
 Placing Abomination, A. D. 533-538
- 32-33 Papal persecution through the centuries
- 34,35 Protestant Reformation, 1517 -
- 36-39 Character and creed of the Papacy.
- 40-45 Unfulfilled Prophecy this side of 1844
 King of the South -- Mohammedanism rife in Egypt, Africa, etc.
 King of the North -- The papacy, supported by the "Ten Kingdoms,"
 the conflict being one between Mohammedanism and Popular Christianity.

Paraphrase of Daniel 11, by Professor H.C.Lacey:

1. "Also I (Gabriel) in the first year of Darius the Mede (B.C. 538) even I, stood to confirm and strengthen him (Darius 538-536)

2. "And now will I (Gabriel) show thee (Daniel) the truth (concerning the future of Medo Persia, Greece, Rome pagan and papal, and the establishment of the Kingdom of God. Behold, there shall stand up (reign) yet three kings in Persia; (Cambysee, Smerdis, and Darius Hystaspes); and the fourth (Xerxes 485-465) shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia (in the illfated expedition which met disaster at the battles of Thermopylae Salamis [B.C. 480] and Platea [479])

3. "And a mighty king (Alexander the Great) shall stand up (reign 336-323 B.C.), and shall rule with great dominion (practically the then known world from Macedon to India and Thrace to Egypt), and do according to his will.

4. "And when he (Alexander the Great) shall stand up (reign), his kingdom shall be broken (by his death 323), and shall be divided (by his generals, 36 of them, but only 5 prominent ones) toward the four winds of heaven (west, north, east and South); and not to his (Alexander's) posterity (his sons Aegus and Hercules), nor according to the dominion ~~which~~ which he (Alexander) ruled (no succession equaled Alexander's in power): for his (Alexander's) kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others (Cassander, Lysemmachus, Seleucus, Ptolemy) besides those.

5. "And the king of the south (Ptolemy Lagus or Soter I, 323-285) shall be strong (by annexing Cyprus, Phoenicia, Caria, Cyrene and many islands and cities); and one of his (Alexander's) princes; and he (Seleucus Nicator 312-280) shall be strong above him (Ptolemy

Lagus), and have dominion; his (Seleucus') dominion shall be a great dominion (extending from Phrygia, Cappadocia Syria on the west to the Indus on the east, ~~322~~ 301 B.C., battle of Ipsus, and after 281 B.C. the death of Lysemmachus, all his dominion--thus finally ruling over three-fourths of Alexander's empire).

6. "And in the end of years (B.C. 249) they (Ptolemy Philadelphus 235-247 and Antiochus Theus 261-246) shall join themselves together (in an alliance); for the king's daughter of the south (Berenice, daughter of Pt. Philadelphus) shall come to the king of the north (Antiochus Theus) to make an agreement (by marriage): but she (Berenice) shall not retain the power of the arm (the affection and protection of Antiochus, who divorced her and recalled his former wife, Laodice); neither shall he (Antiochus Theus) stand (continue to reign, for he was poisoned by Laodice to prevent a recurrence of his feebleness), nor his arm (his seed, his child by Berenice): but she (Berenice) shall be given up (betrayed to death by her protectors), and they that brought her (her Egyptian attendants and he (margin) whom she brought forth (her son), and he that strengthened her in these times (her attendants)).

7. "But out of a branch of her (Berenice's) roots (parents) shall one (Ptolemy Euergetes I, 247-122) stand up (reign) in his (Ptolemy Philadelphus') estate (Egypt), which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress (Seleucia) of the king of the north (Seleucus Callinicus), and shall deal against them (had Laodice put to death, and defeated Seleucus), and shall prevail (made himself master of all Syria and Celicia and conquered all the country as far as Babylon).

8. "And shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods (2500 statues, many of them being Egyptian idols captured by Cambyses

in 525), with their princes (generals he captured, etc.), and with their precious vessels of silver and gold ("a prodigious quantity" "besides 40,000 talents of silver, \$50,000,000); and he (Ptolemy Euergetes) shall continue more years (4 or 5) than the king of the north (Seleucus Callinicus) who died in 226 B.C. Ptolemy died in 221 B. C.).

9. "So the king of the south (Ptolemy Euergetes) shall come into his (Seleucus Callinicus') kingdom (Syria, etc), and shall return into his own land (Egypt). (The people named him Euergetes in commemoration of this campaign in restoring the gods!)

(Adjourned to 3 P.M.)

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

Study by W.W.Prescott.

While Eld. Daniells is speaking on this subject (The Holy Spirit) I would like to read in connection with it just a few words. The extract which Eld. Daniells read from Desire of Ages is found with considerable other added matter in "Gospel Workers," beginning on page 284. What I wish especially to read is found on page 285:

"We cannot use the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is to use us. Through the Spirit God works in His people 'to will and to do of His good pleasures.' But many will not submit to this. They want to manage themselves. This is why they do not receive the heavenly gift. Only to those who wait humbly upon God, who watch for His guidance and grace, is the Spirit given. The power of God, awaits their demand and reception. This promised blessing, claimed by faith, brings all other blessings in its train."

The reason why the Holy Spirit brings all blessings in His train is because He is the representative of Christ, and all spiritual blessings are in Christ. And we have only so much of Christ as we have of this Spirit of Christ. We only know Christ as we know the Spirit of Christ. So the whole matter of our experience turns right there. This intellectual knowledge, this mere presentation of a Christ to the mind, is not sufficient. It must be an experience. This knowing Him is not an intellectual experience merely; it is a heart experience, and it is a life experience.

The impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of the life of Christ. Then only in the measure that we have the impartation of the Spirit do we have Christ. He is our life. The impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of his life, and it is by his life that what He has done for us in His body, in His individual body, is made effective in our body. It is by the impartation of His life. The

impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of the life of Christ. We are taught of God by the impartation of His life. It is the way He teaches us, not by merely imparting ideas to us, as I have tried to emphasize,---these ideas must come to us as life, else we do not know Him; we merely know about Him.

He teaches us by his life, and so the impartation of the Spirit, the impartation of His life, that is the way He teaches us.

"Only those who are thus taught of God; those only who possess the inward working of the Spirit of God, in whose life the Christ life is manifested, can stand as true representatives of the Saviour."

It goes so far beyond the mere intellectual knowledge, to teach us by His life. He imparts a knowledge of Himself by imparting His life, and it must come to us as an experience, not merely as a matter of the head.

Now we are studying here, not to find some lessons, some outlines to give to some one. We shall receive this knowledge here just in proportion as we receive His life here. That is what I would like to emphasize, that we are not expending time here now for intellectual work simply. And we shall know these things that we are studying as His life is imparted to us, because He teaches by His life. Our minds are to be used of Christ, but we must go beyond the mere intellect, and we must be taught by His life, if we really apprehend the things that we are dealing with.

Further, in the study of the Scriptures we are dealing with, what I am seeking to do is to present the foundation things of the gospel. We have only time for that. We shall not have time to enlarge and work out the whole scheme, but the foundation things, the essential things, the things we are to build upon,---So in dealing with the person of Christ I have been trying to read with you some Scriptures that would show what

this means to us,---that Christ is the essential person in it all, 285
with all, everything, bound up in Him, the person. Now let us read
some further Scriptures this morning.

You remember I tried to emphasize yesterday this idea---the work
of Christ is to bring man to God. Sin separated. He brings man back in-
to fellowship with God. In order to bring man to God, he brings God down
to man in His own person---Emmanuel---God with us. "God was in Christ
reconciling the world unto Himself." He actually brings heaven, brings
God down to earth in His own person. That is why John would say, The kg
kingdom of ~~and~~ heaven is at hand, because He is the kingdom in Himself,--
all inclusive.

Now that sin which separated is rebellion. "I have nourished and
brought up children, and they have rebelled against Me." That rebellion
is shown to be disobedience to the law, just the same as in any country.
Disobedience to the law of the land, disregarding of the sovereign, that
is disloyalty. If we trace out sin in its origin and to its conclusion
we find that the real essence of sin means that rebellion against God,
that would dethrone God, that would dethrone Christ. It is just as real
a thing as any conspiracy, the same as we read of in the 7th chapter of
Isaiah, where Israel and Ephraim were confederate against Judah, and were
going to put off the king of Judah, and put the son of Tabeal in his place.
That was a conspiracy against the kingdom, against the king, Sin
that is a
real conspiracy against the kingdom, and the real purpose of it is to put
the sovereign down from His throne and put another in His place. It is
not merely doing this thing or that thing or the other thing. That is a
part of the experience, that is a part of the manifestation of it. But
the real purpose back of it all is to put down God and Christ from the
throne of the universe, to enter God's place.

Now righteousness is the reverse of that. Righteousness---loyalty

to the government, loyalty to the sovereign, obedience to his law, everything submitted to His will---that is ~~amazing~~ righteousness.

Now the purpose of His giving His Son, although the rebellion was directed right against Him and His Son, yet He gave His only begotten Son to cure that rebellion. No such thing has ever been found in the universe, such an exhibition of love on the part of the One against whom this rebellion was raised. He gave Himself in the person of His Son to cure this rebellion, to restore this harmony, and to bring back man to the loyalty of the government, and that to be shown by obedience to His law.

J.N.Anderson: Do you refer primarily to the person rather than to the law?

W.W.Prescott: I tried to emphasize yesterday that sin is in the being rather than simply in the act, that the act is simply the manifestation of the real being. Righteousness is the same.

J.N.Anderson: What I mean is, Is sin more a disagreement with the person than with the standard that he has set up?

W.W.Prescott: Both. I would not distinguish between them. Sin is lawlessness, but that law is simply the expression of His character, and you cannot separate between a person and his law, in the government of God. Of course you might with men, but not in the case of God. When we come to have the law written in our hearts, as we shall show, it is because the person is there. That is the writing of the law in our hearts. So I would not distinguish between the two.

A.G.Daniells: But really the law written on the stones was the expression of the character of the Person, so that really sin is not primarily transgression against that law written on the stone, but it is rebellion against the righteous character of God.

W.W.Prescott: Exactly. That is the very nature of sin. That being the nature of sin, the only one who can deal with that is the

person whose character is revealed in that law, and since that law is written in the heart, that is by the impartation of the life of ~~grace~~ which the law is simply the expression.

J.N.Anderson: So essentially sin becomes a conflict with the person. Fundamentally it is more resistance to the person than to his law.

W.W.Prescott: Yes. At the same time I would be careful not to separate the law and the person in the divine government.

Let us study further Scriptures, in which we will endeavor to see the person of Christ revealed to us as the one in whom all blessings are found.

"Blessed by the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." Eph. 1:3.

Now that is different from saying, "This book is in my pocket." That book is not a part of me. Now all spiritual blessings are in Him, but you cannot take them out separate from Him, because he and the blessings are inseparably united in His own person and in his life. Therefore to receive these blessings, we must receive Him, and to attempt to separate the blessings from Him is to receive simply a description of the blessings in the mind.

It is from that standpoint that it is asking for a full manifestation of life.

Eph. 2:7: "That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus."

Kindness becomes a personality in that way,--"his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." And we are not to separate his kindness, his mercy, his love, from the person of Christ.

Phil. 3:9: "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

That was the expression of the fulness of the desire of the Apostle Paul after he had his actual experience. All flowed from that. Without that primary experience nothing else would flow from him.

Col. 1:27, 28: "To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus."

Notice in this the two things that are set before us: First, the mystery is Christ in you. The end to be sought in preaching Christ is to perfect every man in Christ. Here you have the double view.

Jer. 23:5, 6: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, ~~Jeh~~ THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

Now let us have with that the next scripture, Phil. 3:9:

"And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

Jeremiah 23 prophesies of that righteousness found in him, "the Lord our righteousness." Now, isn't it perfectly clear there that righteousness is a personality? that righteousness is Christ? Is that perfectly clear from reading the text that there is no righteousness as an abstract idea? When we have the righteousness which is of faith, we have Christ our righteousness.

I Cor. 1:30: "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

He is made wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption: Then wisdom is a person. The wisdom we must deal with is a personality, and not mere intellectual keenness. The righteousness that we must deal with is a personality, and not a mere abstract idea about goodness. The sanctification that we must deal with is a personality. The redemption that we must deal with is a personality. He is made unto us redemption, He righteousness, He sanctification, He ~~wisdom~~ wisdom. It would have been impossible that we should have known such wisdom, such righteousness, such sanctification, such redemption, had not he who from eternity had been God's wisdom (read it in the 8th chapter of Proverbs, which sets Him forth as wisdom from eternity), If he had not taken the flesh, otherwise he could not be made to us in sinful flesh, wisdom, sanctification, righteousness, and redemption. If it were sufficient simply to have a treatise on this subject, he might have sent

a treatise to us to tell us about righteousness, about redemption, sanctification and wisdom, and exalt us to it. But there was an impassible gulf between us. The only way we sinful beings can enter into that experience is that he himself took our flesh and became Jesus, the man, and then he, as a man, as wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption, brought these things to us. In him we have redemption. Then, because of his taking sinful flesh, and thus bringing God in wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption to the flesh, we can know that experience more than as intellectual ideas about righteousness. We know him as our righteousness, and he is made unto us righteousness. There is no righteousness apart from Him. This brings us face to face with what I talked about before,--that all doctrine becomes a personality in Christ, and that any doctrine outside of him is a mere abstraction without any power or life. It is a mere theoretical knowledge of Christ, simply ideas about Christ which the mind is capable of dealing with; but that is a very different thing from presenting Christ so that the person is presented.

II Peter 1:4: "Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."

When we know righteousness, we know it by becoming partakers of the divine nature. That experience can only be by the impartation of the very life of Christ by the Spirit. That is why that is emphasized. That ~~is~~ impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of the life. The Spirit makes effectual in us what Christ has done for us. But that Spirit makes that effectual by being that to us, not simply handing out something, but being that to us in the very life and person of Christ.

Hebrews 12:10: "For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness."

We have spoken of God as the righteous One. His Son, as revealed, is called the righteousness, because he brings that righteousness to humanity. We have spoken of the Lord as the Holy One. Christ was the holy Child Jesus. How are we to enter into this experience? By becoming partakers of his holiness, and his holiness is not to be separated from his being. That is, we are to be partakers of him. The next scripture will bring it out.

Hebrews 2:14: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, ~~as~~ he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil."

Hebrews 3:14: "For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end."

Because we are partakers of flesh and blood, he partook of the same. That brought ~~the~~ man by becoming man. Now turn it right about. We are to partake of him. You see he made it possible that we should be partakers of him by his ^{first} partaking of us. He partook of the same flesh and blood that we have. That was from his side. The door of heaven was closed. It had to be opened from the heaven side. We can not open it from our side. He opened it and came down and partook of our flesh and blood, and became man. We, by that means, became partakers of him, and that is far beyond any idea of simply hearing about him and accepting him as being in harmony with certain teachings about him. The impartation of the Spirit is the impartation of the life of Christ, and this makes effectual in us what he has done for us.

(PRESCOTT--Cont'd)

272

These Scriptures I have brought together in this way to help us to see the relation that the Word of Christ bears to the very Government of God. And therefore our relation to this experience as to the question of the divine government and the divine Law..

Ps. 97:2 (Reading) "Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne." Let us read the Revised Version because it brings out the thought clearer: "Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne."

The Government of God rests upon righteousness and justice. To interfere with righteousness and justice is to interfere with God's government. Therefore the whole question of receiving righteousness is a question of personal relation to the divine government of God. It is more than whether we shall do this or that thing. That is simply an ~~outward~~ outward expression of an experience. But when we know the government of God is founded upon righteousness and justice and we attempt to overthrow righteousness or depart from righteousness, or in any way interfere with the experience of that righteousness (you remember the throne is a living Throne--Eze. 1:- it is not like a stone foundation--it is a living righteousness)--to interfere with that righteousness is to interfere with the very life of God, which is the foundation of all things.

Ps. 47:8 "God reigneth over the heathen; God sitteth upon the throne of his holiness." Righteousness is the foundation of his throne. His throne is a throne of holiness. Now anything that interferes with the holiness and the expression of a

that holiness. Keep these two ideas in mind--righteousness and holiness. Anything that interferes with this expression, is striking at the very government of ~~God~~ God. Is not that plain from these scriptures?

Now the gospel--this whole experience, is not simply that you and I may be saved from doing a thing that is wrong, or that you and I may get into heaven. The only way we can be saved from doing that which is wrong or get into heaven is by being in harmony with the divine Government. That is the very character of God. His throne is involved in that government. Sin would take away the very foundation of his throne. The gospel recognizes the foundation of his throne--his divine government--and the gospel is to bring us into right relationship with the very foundation of his Government.

Ps. 48: 1 "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness." These ideas of righteousness and holiness I want to connect with the person of God--the very foundation of his throne.

Isa. 2x2 6:1-3. "In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." Isaiah saw the King--the Lord of Hosts. He saw him on his throne, and when he saw him on his throne he heard these voices proclaiming the holiness of the King of the Universe. Now that vision Isaiah saw was the foundation of Isaiah's prophecy.

Isa. 7:14: "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. "

Isa. 8:10: " Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for God is with us."

What is that word in the Hebrew?--God is with us? Immanuel. Now Isaiah saw the King, ~~the~~ the Lord of Hosts on a throne. He saw him as the Ruler. He saw him in his holiness. That idea of his Sovereignty and Holiness-- his character--Justice and Righteousness also.

Now in the seventh chapter you find a conspiracy against ~~the~~ Government. ~~the~~ (Notice how much force there is in the connection of Scriptures.) The Syrians had conspired to put another king in the place of the king of Judah. That was rebellion. Now what is the cure for that rebellion? Isaiah says, "It will not stand. It will not succeed. The Lord will give you a sign. Immanuel. It is because ^{of} Immanuel--God with men--that the conspiracy against the Government of God does not succeed.

Now comes the eighth chapter. (You must not separate this prophecy, because the sixth is connected with the seventh, the seventh with the eighth, and the eighth with the ninth. Because when we come to Isaiah 9:6 it says, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given", and that takes us back again to the sixth chapter for the connection.) In the eighth chapter we find this conspiracy. And Isaiah says it will not succeed. Why? Immanuel--God with us. Now this is but a picture

275

presented in this connection where Isaiah saw the rightful king on his Throne in his holiness, and was so deeply impressed that he regarded himself as undone. Then the very next picture presented was this rebellion ~~against~~ to put another king in God's place. This is the whole picture of sin. Now what is the cure? Immanuel. That became Isaiah's watchword; and therefore he prophesied that Jerusalem should not be overthrown, even when Sennacherib himself was facing the city, and his captain made that insulting announcement to the people. Isaiah said, "Jerusalem shall not fall." Going back to this sixth chapter we get the ~~same~~ connection. That is the picture presented. It is a conspiracy ^{Government.} against ~~the government~~. It is a question of putting down a person from his throne. And the whole cure for that is Immanuel. But this is a Person. It is ~~Christ~~ God coming in the Person of his Son in holiness and righteousness, to become a man, that the conspiracy will not succeed, and the divine Government will stand in spite of sin, and that we may be restored to perfect harmony with God and dwell with him.

romans 7:12: "Wherefore, the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." What is the word for "just?" Righteousness. Now here is where the law comes in. He is holy. Now the law is righteous. He is righteous. The foundation of the government of God is righteousness and holiness. Now we come to the question of the relation of the law to this matter. We find he is righteous--that is, the child Jesus--the righteous One, his holy One. Now the law is holy. The law is righteous.

Exa Ex. 19:5,6: "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel."

Now this was the Old Covenant. This was a covenant of loyalty, as shown by obeying the law. That portion of it is all right. The question is what did that covenant of loyalty involve. It contains the record of the giving of the ten commandments. Then what would loyalty mean? conformity to that law. And it is that law that is holy and righteous and spiritual—not simply as a code. It involves our loyalty to God. And our covenant is simply a covenant of loyalty. And our loyalty will be revealed in our conformity to that law which is the very expression of the being of God—holy, righteous and spiritual.

Psalms 119:143, 151, 172 "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth. . . .Thou art near, O Lord; and all thy commandments are truth. . . .My tongue shall speak of thy word: for all thy commandments are righteousness."

What I want to call attention to is that the person of Christ and the law are spoken of in the same terms. The commandments are righteousness--the commandments are truth. Now this is dealing with the law, not simply as a word but as the very expression of his being in the person of his Son. And this is the only way he can be such to us.

Romans 8:3 "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." (second verse also) "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

Now the law must become the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, for the law is righteous as he is righteous, and the law is truth as he is truth. So it becomes personal. We deal with the law in Christ as a personal expression, not simply an expression in words.

W W PRESCOTT: Brother Lacey spoke about emphasis in reading. Contrast this between the person and the sacrifice. "Lo I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me. I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart." "I have proclaimed glad tidings of righteousness." This is the gospel of righteousness by faith. The good tidings of righteousness. I have not his that righteousness within my heart, I have let it out. I have declared thy faithfulness and salvation by being that. I have not concealed ~~that~~ thy loving kindness. I am the truth. I am come for what purpose? The ceremonies don't avail for the thing. No outward act can avail. I am come. In the volume of the book ~~is~~ it is written of me. A person is the center of it. I have presented righteousness in the great congregation. I have not refrained my lips. I made known thy truth by being that. I, the person.

Hebrews 10:4-9: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second."

What is the first? Sacrifice and offering. What is the second? The Lord himself.

It is the whole question of the difference between outward things and the person. Isn't that clear? The Psalm is quoted here in Hebrews. You will notice quite a difference in the reading, but I do not want to dwell on that now. I wanted to call attention to the fact that in the Psalms and in the Hebrews the contrast is between outward forms, ceremonies, things that man can do, and the person. I am come. It is when we know the person that we are able to establish the fact by doing the will of God. If we don't know the person, we are simply back under forms and ceremonies, something outward. The thing of importance is doing the will of God apart from that system of ceremoniss, just as was prophesied in the Psalms, spoken of in Hebrews as the fulfillment, and has great force where it comes in the epistles. That will begin to emphasize to us the fact that I am trying to bring out, and that is that all doctrine must be personality, and that we must deal with a person and not with abstract ideas about a person.

[Intermission for fifteen minutes]

Called to order at 1005 am

H C LACEY: [At the opening of his remarks, Brother Lacey went over the last part of his previous presentation of Daniel 11, which appears in the report of July 6.]

There is another brief study I wanted to introduce, and that was going into further specifications showing that Daniel 10-12 in this latter portion, simply picks up and emphasizes certain specifications in Daniel 8 and 9. I have selected twelve specifications. There may be more. [Brother Chas. Thompson was asked to turn to Daniel 8, and Brother Tait to Daniel 11, reading such

verses as might be called for]

I will give the point, and then we shall take the text. The first is on the time of the rise or emergence of this power. In Daniel 8:23 there is a statement made. Please read: "And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up." (RV) We all understand that that is this little horn, Rome pagan and papal. The phrase I want out before you is this: "In the latter time of their kingdom." Whose kingdom? The kingdom brought to view in the preceding verse, the four horns of the goat. We take about the year ~~133~~ 168, the Battle of Pidna, for the rise of the Roman power. Rome was then emerging into the position of supremacy. It was in the latter time of their kingdom when this one arises.

Now one expression from the 9th verse. Dan. 8:9: "And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the glorious land." That is the verse of which the 23rd verse is the exposition. Out of one of them, that is, out of the Macedonian horn there should come this little horn which should wax exceeding great. The power of the little horn is connected with its emergence from that state. Ethnically and racially the Roman power didn't emerge from the Greek, but when Rome conquered Macedon at the Battle of Pidna it stepped on the stage and began its career on universal supremacy.

Now the Hebrew expression for "out of one of them" is

, and the word "out of" is the word min, and is used

to express this relationship of Rome with the Greek kings. Not ethnically or racially, but politically or nationally. It rose to prominence and dominance after it had conquered Macedon, and so came out of it. That preposition min is used in Dan 11:31. These are parallel points I am giving you. The time of the rise of this power in this verse is brought to view in verse 31. You may read the verse (Dan. 11:31, R.V.): "And forces shall stand on his part, and they shall profane the sanctuary, even the fortress, and shall take away the continual burnt-offering, and they shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate."

The phrase that we are looking at is this: "Forces shall stand on his part." That isn't the interpretation we want at this juncture, and I am suggesting another one to you. It is this: "Arms shall stand up after him." Now I want to substantiate that. That Hebrew word is just the same as the word min. The word that is translated "on his part" is the word that is translated "out of them" in Daniel 8. Over here, when we come to verse 31, our version has translated it "on his part." I suppose you all appreciate the looseness of the authorized version, and in many cases, of the revised. Where there seemed to be no particular reason for diverging from the authorized version, they retained it. I will give some other standard translations. Perhaps you would like to take some of them.

1. "After himself arms shall stand up." Newton, p. 294

LACEY: "After him, arms shall stand up."

WILKINSON: Is that the same word "min" in this case? I have the Hebrew and it is "mintel" (?)

Elder Tait asked how the words are assimilated in the Hebrew; the m is assimilated with the other word where it is joined.

ANDERSON: It could be "min min who or min min lou" (?) . The min is never joined to the word where it has the article.

LACEY: These are all technical questions. I was going to read Bishop Newton's statement. He says: "Thus it is expressed by Daniel, And after him arms, that is the Romans, shall stand up." He does not emphasize it but says that as in Nehemiah 13:21 it reads "From that time forth" so it could be understood here. Bishop Newton refers back to Taylor's concordance as evidence that this article is used in this way.

Isaac Newton also has something on this. You will find it in his book page 303. "And after him arms, that is the Romans, shall stand up."

Then Keith in "Signs of the Times Vol. 1, page 75" says "Arms shall stand on his part, or shall stand up after him" and that is what he emphasized.

Elliott has a note on that in Vol. 3, 1st edition page 1317-1319. He discusses these verses and says "From out of". So on verse 7 he says "Out of a branch from her roots". There it occurs again. Dan.8:9. "Out of one of them came forth a little horn". But it also indicates chronologically succession afterwards. Gen.38:24; Deut.15:1; Dan.11:23; 2 Sam.23:2 4. These are all texts in which this word occurs.

(Different men read the texts showing how after, or out of, is used in the same connection.)

LACEY: And such I conceive to be the meaning here. "After him shall arms stand up; namely the king of the north as previously spoken of, who is of course Antiochus Epiphanes. And after 168 when he heard of the Roman success in battle he yielded to their request that he withdraw from Egypt although he was at the head of a successful army and had a city surrounded which would have undoubtedly fallen into his hands. Yet he submitted.

"After him". Just as soon as we are brought to that point, the prophet passes over to Rome. "After him shall arms stand up as in the beginning"; when Xerxes swept into Greece, and the next point is Alexander the Great.

I want to read further what he says. Our English translation, it seems to me, is not happy in its rendering of this preposition because it gives no idea of the various meanings of the verse. He has a book in which Daniel's last prophecy is dealt with in a verse by verse way, comments and helpful matter being given on the original Hebrew, etc. The book is on Revelation but has a section dealing with Daniel.

To me that is conclusive. Of course the fact that there may be other renderings is nothing against it.. I understand there is some question today about whether it should be rendered "in" or "at" in some cases. Sometimes one is better and sometimes the other. That is where a man of course becomes interpretative in rendering the original text. You cannot help in some way putting your conception in the rendering. That is why we should avail ourselves of the keys to the Word, at least with the Hebrew and the Greek wherever possible.

DANIELLS: You tell us now that it is hard to help making the rendering that will support what we believe?

LACEY: What I mean is that in a man translating the Bible, he will come face to face with a phrase or word which may be rendered in different ways, and he chooses the one in harmony with his idea. He is putting his interpretation on it. You never can avoid that.

There is evidence to show that it is possible to render this "after him". Elliott, Isaac Newton, Keith, Bishop Newton, Spurrell and others might be cited who so render it.

Now let us look at the second point. That is the time. The second point is this characteristic. I should say, its worldly characteristic. I would like you to take Daniel 8:23 for the expression in the 8th chapter, and Dan.11:31 for it in the 11th chapter. We are trying to get every point here.

"And a king of fierce countenance", suggests a warlike character. Rome was a warlike empire, and one of the greatest that has arisen. Now turn to an entirely different figure in Dan.11:31. It reads, -I shall read it because we want to get this new way of reading it. "Arms shall stand up after him." It is suggested that the arms suggest embracing and taking in the whole world; and on top of the Roman standard, we are told, was the flag of course, then the eagle, and very frequently they had two arms extended with an open palm. You will find proof of that in Eddy, Vol.3, p.1331. This fits the application. "Arms shall stand after him".

Now let us take the third point; its rise to world dominion. Dan.8:23 for the expression in the 8th chapter, and Dan.11:31 for the corresponding one in the 11th chapter.

BOWEN: Of course these texts referred to in the eleventh chapter have always been applied to the Papacy.

LACEY: Yes. It is just a case bearing on this division of it. "A King of fierce countenance shall stand up". That root is used for a new prince. Thus, a new prince shall stand up. We have that in our version. You know how it is used; three kings shall stand up. Dan.11:2,3,4,6,7,14,15,18,--sometimes translated "stand" and sometimes "stand up" but always indicating a new king coming up. Also verses 17,20,21,23,25, and 31.

(Prof. Lacey continuing)

Dan. 12:1, 13. Elliott, Vol. 3, page 1299, gives an excellent comment on the original texts all the way through from the 11th chapter. We will take up some of these passages. "Arms shall stand up." Dan. 11:3. "There shall stand up yet three kings." Third verse -- a mighty king shall what? Stand up. Here it is translated "arms shall stand up after him." Dan. 12:2: "And at that time shall Michael stand up." I pick out the great outstanding points in this highway of prophecy. Greece stands up, then Rome stands up, and then the kingdom of God is established. And so that word means, successive kings in that line stood up, and others stood up.

Its attitude toward the sanctuary. And here we are leaving the technical points and come now to the real spiritual meaning of the prophecy. Its attitude toward the sanctuary. Dan. 8:11,13,14. We cannot study the verses defining the work of the little horn without seeing that the sanctuary, or its position to the sanctuary, was the chief point in Daniel's mind; so much so that in the final interrogation "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily, and the transgression of desolation," etc., we find that the most prominent thing in it was the daily -- the attitude of the little horn toward the daily. Dan. 11:31.

Let us have verses 11, 13, 14 of Daniel 8:

"Yea he magnified himself even to the prince of the host and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of the sanctuary was cast down. . . Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint

which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

Simply notice that the emphasis is placed upon the attitude toward the sanctuary of the little horn.

Dan. 11:3: "And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will." After him shall stand up a mighty king -- Antiochus Epiphanes. I take it that what is meant is the heavenly sanctuary.

Prof. Prescott: In verse 31 imperial Rome is referred to. Is imperial Rome any part of this?

Prof. Lacey: Yes, it ought to be. As I understand it, there is Pagan Rome, and Papal Rome, and then the little horn in Daniel, referring to Papal Rome. Pagan Rome ruined the earthly sanctuary, and it is Papal Rome that ruins the heavenly sanctuary.

Elder Daniells: What does Elliott tell you about that sanctuary?

Prof. Lacey: I don't think he throws any light on the sanctuary question. The light on the sanctuary question was brought out by our people.

G.B. Thompson: Is this Pagan or Papal Rome that is referred to? (Question not distinctly understood)

Prof. Lacey: I take it, it is both, so far as this power itself, Pagan Rome, is concerned. Pagan Rome destroyed the earthly sanctuary. Ecclesiastical Rome destroys the heavenly.

that ministration in the earthly sanctuary, and 503 when the Roman priesthood was established in opposition to Jesus as Mediator; when the Pope himself said that he was the infallible priest, and nobody could criticise him. You see with this we have a new view of the daily. I believe that the new view of the daily is the correct view of the daily. (Reference is made to the Protestant Magazine of January 1913, Nos. 10, 11, 12.)

M.C. Wilcox: May I present this comment by a noted Hebrew scholar: "The writer has a copy of John Bellamy's translation of Daniel 11:31, interspersed by notes in script by some unknown theological student. That student remarks on the missing term which should follow 'continual.' 'In this hiatus lies a great mystery, the solution of which offers the clue to the interpretation of the whole of the latter part of the book.'" There is a beautiful thought in that.

Prof. Lacey: "They shall take away the daily" Dan. 11:31. "By him ~~wh~~ the daily was taken away." Now the arms are represented -- they, the arms, shall take away the daily. This refers to ecclesiastical Rome.

Sixth point: Its spiritual character.

Pagan Rome destroyed the earthly sanctuary and terminated its sacrifices, and Papal Rome has polluted the heavenly sanctuary, taken the place of the Priest of the sanctuary, and has taken away the daily. This is the spiritual character. Dan. 8:13 is a parallel to Dan. 11:31. In the rendering of this in the Greek the idea is given "the transgression that causes desolation or appallment; the transgression that makes desolate." This thought is more in harmony with other texts in the Bible -- "transgression that causes desolation." The most intensive word that we have in

that line -- appallment.

Prof. Prescott: Refers to the expression "transgression that makes desolate" in Dan. 11:31 as the same as in Matthew 23 -- "Thy house is left unto thee desolate."

Prof. Lacey: It causes appallment. It is the same Hebrew word as in Daniel 8:13 in Dan. 11:31. The two are identical. "All the world wondered after the beast."

Elder Tait: Calls attention to the margin, which says "restoration."

Prof. Lacey: When Daniel saw this horn in the seventh chapter he wondered at that little horn, and this is what he asks the question about. He marveled at it -- wondered in astonishment. In Rev. 13 it states "all the world wondered after the beast." It is the transgression of desolation or appallment.

Seventh, His Guile.

Dan. 8:25: "And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many. He shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand."

There is something peculiarly wise about Rome. Even as a government her wisdom is marveled at to the present day. It is impossible to deny that the policy of the church of Rome has been a masterpiece of human wisdom. It has been a marvel that she could sustain such doctrines against such opposition for so long a time.

Dan. 11:32: "And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupt by flatteries; but the people that do

know their God shall be strong, and do exploits."

Eighth point: Persecuting Power.

Dan. 8:24: "And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people."

Pagan Rome destroyed three million Christians, and Ecclesiastical Rome has destroyed many millions.

Dan. 11:33,34: "And they that be wise among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame and by captivity, and by spoil, many days. Now when they shall fall they shall be helped with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries."

Overbearing persecution brought to view in both chapters.

Ninth point: Pride.

Dan. 8:25: "And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand."

"He shall magnify himself in his heart." We talk of the arrogance of the Papacy -- of the reverence demanded of kings, -- kissing the feet of the Pope, etc.: magnifying himself in his heart.

11th chapter, 36th verse: "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against

the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished; for that that is determined shall be done. "

Some reference made to the Hebrew word)

There is the point where a misrepresentation has been set forth in our books. In "Thoughts on Daniel" it is stated "any king," or "a certain king." It is the king. This is much more correct and logical. We turn over onto France on a false premise. It will not bear that interpretation. It is the king that shall exalt himself.

Elder Tait: I was talking with Professor Salisbury about how that was given in the Hebrew-- and I suppose he knew Hebrew about as well as any man among us-- and he said that we could not very well avoid the fact that the Hebrew there was going back to what had gone before. Yet I think he held the old view.

Prof. Lacey: I think he held it as a question.

Elder Daniells: He did not seem to think that the rendering "the king" made that view impossible?

Prof. Wilkinson: (Made a brief remark, but could not hear only ---) Brother Uriah Smith puts it "a king," or "another one" and turns us from the premises.

Prof. Lacey: I notice Uriah Smith gives "a certain king," and makes reference to Robinson in his book on that which says that king is not the king mentioned in verse 27 but has the same appearance of that king, and gives the translation "a certain king." The king, the special king, I have in mind. ~~There~~ That is where we get ~~the~~ different ideas. Newton makes a change on the 18th verse, and applies it to ----- clear down to verse 36, where he refers to the Papacy and comments "a king."

Tenth: The blasphemous pride.

Dan. 8:11: "yea he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down."

And with this notice Daniel 11:36,37: "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished: for that that is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all." And Daniel 8:25:

"And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand."

There is the blasphemy against God. In Dan. 11:36,37 we see that brought to view --"he shall magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god." He magnifies himself above God, against every god. We need not necessarily read infidelity or atheism into that, in that he does not regard God. It would be possible for one not to regard God without denying that there is a God.

Question: How do you explain verse 33?

Prof. Lacey: I think it has the same value; that it is just a continual repetition of that thought --"God of his fathers;" I think it means God.

Elder Tait: It says "neither shall he regard any god -- for he shall magnify himself above all." I think that explains the meaning. He does not deny any God, but he does not regard any God; he shall magnify himself.

Elder Daniells: Do you mean the Papacy, or the Pope? Would we like to put out in our books that the Papacy did not regard any God, the living God, or any God at all?

Prof. Lacey: The Papacy, or Papal Rome. This language is quoted in 2 Thess. 2:4. In the margin it refers to this verse: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God." Now all interpretations, except possibly our modern interpretations (modern interpretations are getting very tender towards the Roman Catholic Church) but all the great churches, the reformation churches, apply this to the Papacy.

Elder Daniells: We never have put out that the Papacy never acknowledged any god.

Prof. Lacey: That does not necessarily mean atheism. A child may not regard his father, but does not deny his existence. The Papacy may believe there is a God, but "regardeth not him."

Elder Tait: It says "nor the desire of women," -- does that mean that there was no desire for women?

Prof. Lacey: Not regard the desire of women -- simply that expression. France was atheistic, but we cannot, we do not need to read atheism into this.

Elder Knox: (Asks question -- indistinct)

In relation to God, as far as the carrying out of his plans and purpose is concerned, he dismissed him from his thoughts?

Some reply was made concerning — the Word of God which was his guide.

Prof. Prescott: The New Testament Scriptures in using Old Testament Scriptures interprets and applies Old Testament Scriptures, does it not?

Prof. Lacey: Yes: interprets and applies these principles.

Prof. Wilkinson: May I read a statement from Great Controversy, and ask how 2 Thess 2:4 applies to Daniel 7?

Prof. Lacey: Daniel 7 is also applied to the Papacy.

II Thess. ~~2:4~~ 2:4: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

He places himself above all gods. He follows his own will. But we cannot say that all papists are absolutely bad. The system is satanic, having put itself in the place of God; but many of them have knelt down and worshiped God as best they knew.

Now two more points: Daniel 8:24, 13. Compare this with Daniel 11:36.

Daniel 8:24, 13: "And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered."

Note the statement of the wonderful success achieved.

Daniel 11:36: "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished; for that that is determined shall be done."

There is an interesting point here about the word indignation. Read Isaiah 66:14, Zech. 1:12, Isaiah 10:5, and Daniel 8:19 in this connection. If you look up the instances of the occurrence of that word, you will find that there are 24 of them, and only one that is not used concerning the anger of God.

PRESCOTT: Your point is that the Turks (?) did not prosper?

H.C.LACEY: My point is that in Daniel 8 it says he is going to

practice and prosper until the indignation be accomplished, or until God's anger at the end.

~~XXXXXXXX~~

M.C.WILCOX: Isn't that true of Daniel 8:25?

A.O.TAIT: I remember when the restoration of the papacy was as much a question as the king of the north; but when Sister White wrote her chapter on "The Aims of the Papacy" for "Great Controversy," that settled it.

H.C.LACEY: In Daniel 8:25 it says "he shall be broken without hand. That is the time when the indignation is accomplished, the destruction of that system at the second coming of Christ. In Daniel 11:45, it says: "He shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." That coming to an end, with none helping him, is a parallel of Daniel 8:25. (?)

M.C.WILCOX: In Isaiah the 47th chapter, in speaking of the daughter of Babylon, it says in the last verse, "none shall save thee."

H.C.LACEY: Now let us take a verse-by-verse study of the 11th chapter. I will read the first few verses, interjecting our interpretation of it:

W. W. PRESCOTT

The special step that was taken this morning, or that was covered in a general way, had to do with the idea of sin as rebellion, rebellion against a just government. That spirit of rebellion is to be taken out by a change of nature that would restore loyalty to the king and the kingdom manifested in obedience to the law of God, and then we found that righteousness was the very foundation of God's throne, a living throne founded upon righteousness, also upon holiness. We found that the mountain of his holiness was where his capital stood, and we also found that righteousness and holiness were found in the person of Christ, and that he came to bring these to the world,- the principles of the government of heaven, in his own person. Many terms were used in ~~xx~~ this way to help our finite minds to understand God. We had different views of his character presented in these different words, and different phrases, but these two seem to be quite fundamental because we found, as said, ~~xx~~ that righteousness and holiness are fundamental, the very essence of God's character, the thrice Holy One. Zechariah says, We being delivered from our enemies might serve righteousness and holiness all the day of our lives, which would seem to cover the whole experience of the revelation of the character of God in those who are saved. We touched you remember, in that idea that after Isaiah had seen the king, the Lord of hosts, and had heard him heralded as the Holy One, the very next picture so far as we have presented to us is a picture of conspiracy, an effort to overthrow the original kingdom, and put another in its place. Isaiah said, "Emmanuel, God with us," and we follow it through the prophecy, not in words, but in fact, and we find that was his watchword; it was the basis of his prophecy ~~xx~~ that Jerusalem would not be overthrown, and it was revealed in fact in these two crises,- one in the

reign of Ahaz, and then in the reign of Hezekiah, when Sennacherib came up. The thought I would like to impress is this, that the Greek for this revelation is found in Emmanuel, and phrased in many ways, that is, the Holy Spirit, life in Christ Jesus, writing the law in the heart. It is the presence of that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us in order that we may have fellowship both with the Father and with the Son.

M. C. WILCOX:

To carry out the thought of holiness among God's people, it seems to convey separation from sin and separation unto God.

W. W. PRESCOTT:

Yes, in the use of the word "holy" as applied to inanimate things, that is, the separation from common things, and set apart for service of some kind.

C. P. BOLLMAN:

It seems to me what was said this morning is about the best we have had. I was very much pleased and instructed with it. I like the idea introduced yesterday, that it was not simply right doing, but as we sometimes express it, right being, that it was possible for a man to obey the law perfectly, and yet we would not regard ~~xxx~~ a man of that kind 100% loyalty unless his heart were in it. I never heard that emphasized so strongly and made to stand out so plainly as it was in the study this morning, that it is not only doing, but being right from the heart, in order that we be true to the government of God; it must not simply be the outward life.

W. T. KNOX:

I would like to ask Professor Prescott a question. I am

sorry I was not here this morning, but I conclude from what he has said this afternoon that he has brought us up to the place in his study where the law of God is written in the heart individually. That is one way of speaking of perfection of character. There was a time when it was the nature of man to reveal the character of God. There came another time when it became the nature of man to reveal Satan. We are taught by the Scriptures and by the gift of prophecy, that the time will eventually come when it will become the second nature of man to do the will of God; and I suppose that has been brought out in Professor Prescott's lesson. I would apprehend that in his lesson he showed of course the work of the Spirit of God, and I would like to ask how that is to be accomplished. Is it by the constant, daily work of the Spirit of God that he is doing for us now? Is it through the daily development of character that each of us must be engaged in either for God, or is it by some special operation that the Spirit of God is to perform for us in that great outpouring to which we all look forward?

W. W. PRESCOTT:

You mean the latter rain, Brother Knox?

W. T. KNOX:

I understand that before God takes us over into the kingdom by translation, that is, those who will be translated, they will come to the place where it will be their nature to do righteousness, not that temptation cannot be presented, but they will come to the place where they will say, "Thy law is within my heart. I delight to do thy will."

W. W. PRESCOTT: .

I would ask what power is available at any time in the future which is not available now for any work of grace? What power is available that is not available now? What about looking forward to a time when we shall thus be transformed; when is that time? Is there a sort of definite time for which we must wait, to look forward to before there must be the fullness of revelation of character of God in the individual? ~~Will~~ Will there be any change in God's arrangement or plan ~~as~~ to accomplish his purpose in us?

I suppose we are to distinguish between justification and sanctification. Justification--just as soon as one accepts really the good news concerning the Son of God for what it means, just as soon as he accepts that good news from God's standpoint, God looks upon him in a different way, treats him in a different way. He then is looked upon, dealt with, is one in Christ, and then what God affirms concerning his Son he counts concerning those who are in His Son, and He is well pleased with us, not because of our perfection, but because of the perfection in Christ, and we are hidden in Him, and we become members of his body, and he treats us as he treats his Son, and looks upon us in his Son. That to me is the key to the explanation of what is said in the epistles of Paul, and is repeated so many times in the Ephesians. That experience comes by our accepting the good news concerning his Son. We are studying that good

news. The good news concerning his Son is first, that he is God manifested in the flesh; 2. that he died for our sins; 3. that he was raised from the dead; 4. that he ascended into heaven; 5. that he is our High Priest in heaven; 6. he will come again.

Now these facts are involved in the good news concerning his Son, but they are to be more historic facts; it is the interpretation of these facts in their relation to us that constitutes for us the good news, so that they shall not be simply matters of fact about a person who lived and died and arose again. You will remember when that case came before that Roman ruler, he said he was surprised at what they were disputing about; we find it in the 25th chapter of Acts. This is what Festus is explaining to Agrippa about the case of Paul, concerning "whom when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive." The simple question as he looked at it here is, the man was dead, but Paul's anxiety was that He was alive; that was the vital point in it, that he lived, and died, and arose, and will live forever more.

PRESCOTT: Now it is these facts and our relation to these facts, that puts us on a solid foundation with the gospel. We are looked upon and counted righteous in Him. The problem of the Christian is that that shall become fact in him. Whether that is a sudden experience or a growth. I think it is a growth. 302

KNOX: In other words, that is something that we are not to expect to be accomplished by and by, for us, but is to be a daily struggle for us to attain it.

PRESCOTT: Yes, I think we can use that word, and yet there was with me for a long time a misapprehension as to what is meant by the struggle to attain it. We can use that, but I don't think I comprehended it rightly for a long time. I think the struggle is not so much in our effort to conform our lives to a certain pattern that is set before us in the ordinary sense of the word; that is, Christ must be more than an idea. He is an idea and an example, but must be more than that to us, else we shall fail in our effort to reveal that example. The struggle that comes, as I have come to look upon it, is the struggle of submission which is bound up in faith. It is the good fight of faith. When we know what the word "faith" really means, it involves absolute surrender of the will and means the absolute submission to another life. The struggle is between those two, whether the old nature shall be revealed or be held in absolute abeyance; crucified; dead, and the new life reveal itself. Faith is more than the word; belief is more than the idea of assenting that something is true. When we take the Scriptural meaning, there can be no faith without submission; self-surrender. Faith involves the whole idea of death and the acceptance of the new life and submission to that life constantly. That is intelligent faith, not blind submission. We learn how to do that through the Word;

learn more and more how we are hindering that life and how to 303
take hindrances out of the way. We differ from inanimate
creations. We have the choice constantly before us and can exer-
cise the will and say no to God himself.

BOLDMAN: Then it is not so much living according to certain
rules, but yielding according to a life to be reproduced in us.

PRESCOTT: Yes. Then why do we have so many instructions as
to how to live? Take in Ephesians, you will notice after he has
told of that fullness of revelation and power, he turns right
around and applies it in actual experience. Do not walk as
the Gentiles, ~~men~~ who walk in the darkness of men in the
blindness of their hearts. This means that as you have received
Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in Him.

We are taught these specific, definite things in
order that we shall not allow those things to hinder the revela-
tion of this life. We are not to be hindering but to be in
fellowship with this life. It is not our business to hinder
that life. If that life is manifested in us as it is in Christ
and in His body, we shall reveal that same character, and these
specific things teach us what it means to love. There is one
word involving our whole experience. Love is the expression of
the law. God is love. If one believes the law as God means the
law in its fullest spiritual sense, he is revealing the character
of God. But after man became blind and had gotten away from
God, it became necessary to tell him specifically how to love,
and what it means.

I have a mental picture of it as to love and law.
Law is L-A-W, love's active way. Love is L-I-S-T-E-N law obeyed
voluntarily; eternally. Before man sinned and his mind was

darkened, he could love in accordance with all those specific precepts and would reveal it just that way, but now that his mind is darkened, he has to be told how that love will reveal itself, and then if there is any tendency to reveal itself contrary to that way, the love must disregard it and have some power that will check that and allow the other love to reveal itself in that channel.

Now we are accepted in the Beloved. We are locked upon as saved in Christ. We are justified; we are accounted righteous for His sake in Him. That righteousness must become our life and be revealed in it for our life is covered. Specific instruction teaches how we may put our lives in harmony with God's law of love. And the Ten Commandments, for instance, will tell us how to love God and our neighbor. Those ideas are constantly developed in the little affairs of life so we may know how to love. If there is a feeling comes up to reveal it in some forbidden line, the will must be placed against that and power accepted to check that and hold it in abeyance as though that life were death, and another life reveal itself in harmony with that law.

KNOX: One more question. Then it really is a question of a daily development of character. Now is it our privilege or are we presumptuous in attempting to know for ourselves day by day as the weeks, months and years go by, that we are succeeding in developing that character? Now I think that these questions are getting down to practical Christianity. We are told in the Word many things that would seem to turn our thoughts away from self entirely and only to Christ, which of course in a proper way I accept of; but on the other hand there are Scriptures like "Examine

yourselves and see whether you are in the faith, the paraphrase of which is given in Sister White's instruction, that we should every night examine ourselves and see where we have failed. Now there is a tendency always in the human heart to go wrong. I speak for myself only. But can I recognize day by day that that other power that is in me is trying to get over that and is gradually bringing me into that place where it is not my nature to do wrong things? Now just to make a confession, I don't think I am quite as mercenary as I was when I first came to Washington. But now in every particular isn't that what the Christian who experiences it should know,—that he is making progress?

PRESCOTT: This question brings up that which was to me for a long time a matter of personal trouble and difficulty, and I sometimes got myself into pretty serious difficulty over it. For my part, I think that that self examination is most effective and most helpful which comes to us from our view of Christ. Now ^{Isaiah's} take ~~Isaiah's~~ experience.—I saw the Lord sitting upon his throne. I heard the voices saying "Holy, holy, holy". I am undone. Now that was not very introspective. That was because he saw the Lord and saw his holiness, and then all of himself seemed out of harmony with it.

Take the experience of the apostle Paul. He had examined himself many times and found himself perfect:—Touching ~~the~~ the righteousness of the law, blameless; a pharisee of the pharisees. But when on the way to Damascus he saw a bright light. And in that light he saw himself. He asked Who art thou, Lord? I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. When he saw that light, he saw Paul, and from that day forward, he saw what he had examined and thought something to rest upon in an entirely different light and lost it forever.

I think this question of self-examination, like all these other questions is most satisfactorily and most helpfully carried forward by seeing him in his perfection. And you will remember words almost like this: The closer we get to Jesus, the more imperfections we shall see. That comes not from looking inside, but looking at Him.

There is another phase of that. I always feel a little wary some way, about the expression gradually becoming like Him, and a gradual transformation, a gradual improvement. There is a sense in which I think that we may use these expressions, but I know for my part I had a very wrong idea about it and it did not help me out at all, but got me into trouble over that question for some time, for it led me more to trusting in myself and my own efforts and striving. Some way it is not that, but that I may present every man perfect in Christ. That is the one thing outstanding before God. How to let that perfection in Christ reveal itself in us is our constant problem. That is the Christian life. We are ~~examined~~ accepted of Him constantly if our heart is right with Him. If our purpose and will are on His side, fully yielded to him, we are perfect in Christ. That perfection gives us a standing before God constantly so I may have that standing, and yet there is the other Scripture that we may have boldness in the day of Judgment because as He is, so are we in this world. Suppose I think my standing with God in his decisions in my case depend on my revealing His perfections, and I am cut off today. What about my standing with God? I take it that my standing with God is not dependent upon the perfection with which I reveal the character of Christ from day to day, but that I am in Him with a perfect mind and will submitting to him.

Then, you say, the conduct doesn't count for anything? I say it does. Just as soon as we take advantage of that and see no further reason for this effort all the time to submit, surrender and yield ourselves to Christ, we lose our standing with Him; but with this perfection of the ~~xxxxxx~~ will and choice of the heart, the desire and everything being that we shall live in harmony with Him and reveal his character, we are perfect in Christ.

W.W. PRESCOTT: We are perfect in Christ.

M. C. WILCOX: "For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him." Herein 2 Chron. 16:9

W. W. PRESCOTT: I had another scripture, 2 Cor. 2:14:

"But thanks be unto God, who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest through us the savor of his knowledge in every place." Does that present to your minds the idea that we live a triumphant life in Christ, even when the perfection of Christ may not be reflected in our daily life? We are to maintain that position of triumph in Him. Now we are to learn more and more how to manifest that triumph. The same idea is in 1 Cor. 15:57: "Thanks be unto God who gives us" -- is giving us -- the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. To be able to put those things together right, so that our daily life shall be a life of triumph in Christ, and we thank him day by day that he gives us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ, and yet not claim any perfect revelation of his character. Is it clear what I mean? There's where I have tried to fit things together so far as my experience is concerned. I want to be where every day I can have confidence, assurance, of a standing before God, not in myself, but in Christ. I must maintain that experience, that position in Christ, constantly, which means this surrender, this submission, this acceptance, of his will which just so far as he reveals it to me. Take the application of this on the Sabbath question. Don't you think that there are Christians accepted of God, having a standing with him, who don't keep the Sabbath? [Many say Yes]. Yes. They are not condemned before God, but you and I would be.

If we should say, Therefore, because some people over there have their standing with God and don't keep the Sabbath, I am not going to keep it, I would lose my standing. Just as one brother said, "Do you think anyone can't be saved unless he keeps the Sabbath?" I said, "I think I can't be, because I have the light."

F H ROBBINS: Suppose the Sabbath question is brought to an individual and he refuses it.

W W PRESCOTT: He loses his standing.

F H ROBBINS: Even though he does not give it consideration, simply throws it aside and refuses to investigate?

W W PRESCOTT: I couldn't judge as to the degree of his responsibility. But if the light comes and he rejects it, he loses his justification. "As ye have received Christ Jesus the light, so walk ye in him."

H C LACEY THEN TOOK THE FLOOR

H C LACEY: I think a word of personal apology is usually out of place, but I feel pretty weary this afternoon. This is pretty heavy wading, and I feel it is also heavy for you. Not that you can't follow me, but a whole lot of these technicalities here, these names and so forth, are just swimming around in one's mind. Yet I think we ought to remember that this is God's word, and if he has chosen to give us these dry details, it is because we should learn some lesson from them. I have to remind myself of this constantly. I hope you won't feel that because I am standing behind Daniel 11 that it is a hobby of mine. I would much rather have such lessons as those on the Person of Christ and on spiritual experience. I have consented to give it simply because we were allotted it. It is about the last theme I would

have chosen. As we were assigned this, we wondered, and both demurred, and yet we thought if somebody had to bear the burden, we would try to do our duty.

This question is still indeterminate with me. I have simply felt that as I heard the new vies, I felt inclined toward it. There were points here and there that helped me to feel there was something more solid about it. But I have listened to Elder Daniells time and time again in Australia as he presented the old view, and always felt that it was one of the finest points of present truth. Every point with reference to Constantinople can be presented in regard to the old view. If I had Elder Daniells' ability I could preach from Revelation 16 just as well as from Daniel 11. Here is the chapter. Here is loyalty to the word. Here is faithfulness to historic fact, and it seems to me that in this new view of Daniel there is a little more loyalty on the one side, a little more accuracy on the other. So this comes with a little new light. We lose nothing out of it. Now I will do the best I can to continue through these verses.

A G DANIELLS: You must feel feww and easy, because we are not here under hard oriticism. You understand that this matter has been under discussion, and it has created a lot of upheaval and difficulty in the schools with teachers and students, and an embarrassed situation, and brethren have been saying, Well, we have never gone into it, we haven't searched it out, so they all felt this wae one of the questions we ought to get at. We may not reach any definite conclusion. Certainly there are a great many things to be cleared

up, and we are listening with a great deal of interest to all that you give.

H C LACEY: The determination will depend upon intense study of the language and of history, and we can only do a very telescopic and rapid survey here.

A G DANIELLS: If you feel too weary to go on the whole time, you stop at the end of the period, and let us rest you, and the rest of us can ask some questions.

H C LACEY: As we haven't yet reached the crucial point, I think I will just read this paraphrase with interjected interpretations. In many of these verses, if one reads various authorities, he will find that all of them vary a little bit here and there.

Verse 10. "But his (Seleucus Callimicus) sons (Seleucus Ceraunus, 227-223 and Antiochus Magnus, 224-187) shall be stirred up." The king of the north has passed into the South, has made a great inroad, capturing a large number of Gods, and taken them back with a large lot of booty. His sons are stirred up, "And shall assemble a multitude of great forces, and one (Antiochus Magnus)" of those two sons, the younger was the stronger -- Antiochus Magnus -- "shall certainly come and overflow and pass through" (Antiochus retook Seleucia and recovered his lost possessions in Syria and Phoenicia). "Then shall he return and be stirred up, even to his fortress (Seleucia)."

11. "And the king of the South (Ptolemy Philopater) 222-204) shall be moved with choler (B.C.217), and shall come forth (with 70,000 footmen, 5,000 horses, and 63 elephants) and fight (at the battle of Raphia, B.C. 217) with him, even with the king of the north (Antiochus Magnus): and he (Antiochus Magnus) shall set forth a great multitude (72,000 footmen, 12,000 horses, and 102 elephants) but the multitude (of Antiochus) shall be given into his (Ptolemy's) hand. (Antiochus, badly defeated, returns to Silesia.)

12. "And when he (Ptolemy Philopater) hath taken away the multitude (Antiochus' army), his heart shall be lifted up (in persecution of the Jews); and he shall cut down many ten thousands (40,000 massacred in 213 B.C.): but he shall not be strengthened by it (his subjects were offended by his course, and many provinces revolted from him as a result of his excesses).

13. For the king of the north (Antiochus Magnus) shall return (through Syria), and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former ("an incredible army" Jerome), and shall certainly come after certain years (about 14 years, 217-204 B.C., battle of Raphia to death of Ptolemy Philopater and accession of Ptolemy Epiphanes, 204-181, with a child of 5 years) with a great army and much riches. (204 B.C.)

A. G. Daniels: Brother Lacey, may I ask what authority you used in this study? Did you follow one historian through here where you are making this paraphrase, or different historians?

H. C. Lacey: It is the result of study for several years, and I have used various authorities. It is three or four years since I have said anything about it.

(Paraphrase of Prof. Lacey on Dan. 11)

313

14. "And in those times (204—during the minority of Ptolemy Epiphanes) shall many (Antiochus Magnus, Philip of Macedon; Agathocles, Agathoxenus, Ptolemy, Scopas the Aetolian—Trifundary provinces) stand up against the king of the South (Ptolemy Epiphanes (204 - 181) also the robbers of (among) thy people (Samaritans, etc. [Isaac Newton]) shall exalt themselves to establish the vision (shall revolt from Ptolemy Epiphanes) (to contribute to the accomplishment -- inadvertently -- of this prophecy concerning the calamities to be brought upon the Jewish people by the succeeding kings of Syria (Antiochus Epiphanes!) and they (the revoltors) shall fall (they were attacked and brought back to their allegiance to Ptolemy Epiphanes by Scopas.

15. So the king of the north (Antiochus Magnus) shall come (again into these provinces that had been won by Scopas and Epiphanes after vanquishing (the army of) the Egyptians at Panias. He then pursued Scopas to Sidon, Laga and Patara and made himself master of the whole country. B. C. 198) and cast up a mound and take the most fenced cities (i. e., Sidon into which Scopas with his forces had retired. Here Antiochus Magnus closely besieged Scopas and finally captured the city and forced Scopas to surrender on hard terms); and the arms of the south shall not withstand (the Egyptian forces comprised chiefly of the Aetolians under Scopas and three leading Egyptians generals who were sent to rescue Sidon); neither his chosen people (these three most distinguished generals, Eropus, Meboles, and Demoxenus); neither shall there be any strength to withstand (The Egyptians were totally defeated.)

15. "But he that cometh against him shall do according to his will (that is, Antiochus Magnus who came against Scopas, the Egyptian general. Antiochus was entirely successful in Coel-Syria and Palestine); and none shall stand before him (neither the Aetolians under Scopas, nor the troops from Egypt under Eropus, Menocles and Demoxenus); and he shall stand in the Holy Land (i. e., Antiochus Magnus would gain possession of the Holy Land. This was the immediate result of the capture of Sidon and defeat of Scopas. The Jews readily submitted to Antiochus, going forth in solemn procession to meet him, and supplying abundant provisions for all his army and assisted him to besiege the garrison left by Scopas at Jerusalem.); which by his hand shall be perfected (i. e., Judea shall prosper under Antiochus who ordered the city of Jerusalem to be repaired, the dispersed Jews to return and inhabit it, the temple to be finished and adorned, sacrifices to be continued and priests and Levites to be exempted from taxes, etc., etc. [Bishop Newton P. 277])

16. "But he (Antiochus Magnus) that cometh against him (Scopas the Egyptian general) shall do according to his will (Antiochus was entirely successful in Coele Syria and Palestine); and none (of the Egyptian generals) shall stand before him (Antiochus Magnus); and he (Antiochus Magnus) shall stand in the glorious land (Palestine) which by his hand shall be perfected (he highly favored the Jews).

17. "He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom (Antiochus Magnus, having defeated the Aetolians and Egyptians at Sidon, prepared to subject Egypt

itself and to bring all the original dominion of Alexander the Great under his sway.); and upright ones with him; thus shall he do (better rendered "but he shall make an agreement with him.", i. e., Antiochus did not carry out his original idea, but thought it best to come to terms with Ptolemy Epiphanes, as he had his eyes on Asia Minor, and even Europe as well, and wanted to be on good terms with Egypt at first until his ambitious schemes had materialized); and he shall give him the daughter of women, corrupting her (In pursuance of these arrangements, Antiochus Magnus gave his daughter Cleopatra, who was a noted beauty, in marriage to Ptolemy, but tried to instil into her mind the design of betraying her husband eventually to her father. This was Antiochus effort to corrupt his daughter); but she shall not stand on his side neither be for him (When Cleopatra was married to Ptolemy Epiphanes, she foreook the interests of her father and wholly embraced those of her husband. She subsequently joined with her husband in an embassy to the Romans to congratulate them on their victory over Antiochus Magnus at Thermopylae and to exhort them, after expelling the king from Treese, to prosecute the war in Asia. At the same time they (Ptolemy and Cleopatra) promised that they would readily obey the commands of the Senate.)

17. He (Antiochus Magnus) shall set his face to enter by the whole kingdom (by Alexander, by conquering Egypt) but he ~~{Antiochus Magnus} shall set his face to enter by force and take~~ (Antiochus Magnus) shall make an agreement with him (Ptolemy Epiphanes); then shall he (Antiochus) do; and he (Antiochus) shall give him (Ptolemy Epiphanes) the daughter of women (Cleopatra, his daughter) corrupting her (seeking to get her to betray

her husband (Ptolemy Epiphanes); But she (Cleopatra) shall not stand on his (Antiochus) side, neither be for him..

18. "After this (marriage of Cleopatra and Ptolemy, B. C. 198) shall he (Antiochus Magnus) turn his face (in B. C. 197) unto the isles (campaign in the Aegean sea) and shall take many (Euboea, Samos, etc. and many coast towns, under the protection of the Romans!); but a prince (Lucius Cornelius Scipio) for his own behalf (with his own glory in view) shall cause the reproach (against Rome for the loss of the isles) offered by him (Antiochus) to cease. (by conquering Antiochus) without his own reproach (with an untarnished reputation) he (Lucius Cornelius Scipio) shall cause it to turn upon him (Antiochus Magnus--by defeating him utterly at the Battle of Magnesia, B.C. 190.)

19. "Then (the night after the Battle of Magnesia, B.C.190) he (Antiochus Magnus) shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land (Sardis, then to Apomía, then (next day) to Antioch); and he (Antiochus Magnus) shall stumble and fall and not be found (assassinated while attempting to plunder the temple of Jupiter Belus in Elymais, to pay the ruinous tribute to the Romans).

20. "Then shall stand up (reign) in his estate (place, margin) one that causeth an ~~emator~~ (Heliodorus) to pass over the glory of the kingdom (the temple at Jerusalem--to plunder it in 176 B.C.); and within few days (in 176, a few months after this irreligious attempt) he (Seleucus Philopater) shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle (poisoned by Heliodorus).

65

317

PARAPHRASE OF DANIEL ELEVEN

Verse 21. And in his (Seleucus Philopater's) estate shall stand up (reign) a vile person (Antiochus Epiphanes 176-164) to whom they shall not give (offer) the honor of the kingdom (the sovereignty, for Theliosstarus was plotting for it: another party favoring Ptolemy Philometor: also Demetrius) but he obtained the kingdom (gained the throne of Syria) by flatteries (Eumenes, King of Pergamus and Attalus, the Syrians, the Romans): thus he (Antiochus Epiphanes) came in peaceably (B.C.176) and obtained the kingdom by flatteries.

Verse 22. And with the arms of a flood shall they (Heliodarus, Ptolemy Philometor) shall they be overthrown from before him (Antiochus Epiphanes) and shall be broken (defeated) yea also, the prince of the covenant (Onias III deposed from high priesthood in 175 B.C., and subsequently murdered). And after the league (between 23 Antiochus Epiphanes and Jason, the new High Priest) made with him (Jason) he (Antiochus) shall work deceitfully (deposing Jason, and elevating his brother Menelaus, to the High Priesthood) And (not for) he (Antiochus) shall come up (to the sovereignty) and shall become strong with a small people (his few attendants)

Verse 24. He (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall enter into the peaceable and fat places of the provinces (the upper provinces (Asia Minor?)) also Coele-Syria and Palestine) and he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his father's father (making Timarchus and Heraclides (Rom. 1:27) the one governor of Babylon, the other, his Treasurer): he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall scatter among them (his subjects) the prey (of his enemies) the spoil (of temples) and the riches (of his friends)

(by public shows and public and private largesses) yea, and he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall forecast his devices against the strongholds (of Egypt) even for a season (employing some years in hostile preparations.).