

The Person of Christ.

W.W.Prescott.

I would like to have you give special attention to one or two statements. The statements are these:

The gospel is the good news to us concerning a person who has been manifested, and the facts relating to that person.

Our Christian life is our personal relation to that person and these facts. Now

Now I would like to think about that before we study any further. If that is a correct statement, and we follow that, it will influence, it will guide the whole question of our study of the Scriptures, all our reading, all our teaching, and our preaching. These are absolute facts. We have positive testimony that can not be broken down concerning a person, Christ, who has been manifested in the world, an actual being. There is no dispute about that. There are certain important facts about that person that are absolute, concrete facts, not theological theories, not speculations, not fine-spun drawn-out imaginations. They are facts.

A.G.Daniells: That is wonderfully comforting, too, isn't it?

W.W.Prescott: Yes. We have given up everything else, we have given up any idea of seeking position or money or a good time in the worldly sense; now we want to have something positive to rest upon ~~when we think about that~~ when we think about that. We do not want to rest upon something as an imagination or something as a theological idea. When I have turned aside from everything else and given up all thought of pleasure in a worldly sense, of making money, of gaining position or influence, I want something absolutely sub-

stantial in its place. Now, I dwell upon these things as absolute facts. They are facts that have occurred to that person; they are testified to; we can establish them as absolute facts. I do not think we have dwelt enough upon that; we have been inclined to take too much for granted. But when I face the present and the future, when I face the question of death, when I look it in the face, and know it is coming to me, I must have a certainty about this thing, a certainty that will stand by me when I face the last enemy, so that I will face him without fear. But I have got to have more than a theological theory in my mind.

Our personal experience as Christians depends upon our relation to that person and these great facts. I want to build upon that. Our Christian experience, our Christian life, our certainty in these things, depends upon our personal relation to that person who has been absolutely manifested, and to the great facts concerning that person.

In order to be very definite, I have made a division of these facts, in which I group everything else, so that I can keep this,--deal with it not as a great thing in the air, but as something very definite. These great facts I have set out thus:

1. The Deity of Christ. That is my foundation.
2. The incarnation of the Son of God.
3. The atoning death of that same person.
4. The resurrection of that person.
5. The ascension of that person, as a person, into heaven.
6. The present ministry of that person in heaven as a definite person in a definite place, doing a definite work.
7. The coming back of that person to get me and all others who have kept in right relation to him and these great facts.

Now I say that if we will take these simple statements and give ourselves up to them, it will--it has with me changed my whole experience in the study of the Bible, and in my way of presenting, either in writing or in speaking the great truths of the gospel. And I want

to say that that has not taken me away from the Bible, from the ~~message~~ emphasis to be placed upon certain special truths. In fact it has been that which has helped me to see what these things mean.

Now I distinguish between that sort of an experience, that builds up the message, that strengthens the message in our minds, and that kind of an experience that belittles the message. And the faith I have I want to feel is the faith that builds constantly, strengthens my personal confidence. I am not in this thing from sentiment or theory, or because my father was in it. I am in it from a deep conviction, and I do not want to be ~~led~~ led away from that conviction. When I am led away from that conviction, I am out of it. There is no work that I can do that will be of any value in this movement.

So I hold that personal experience is a primary thing. Then I can try to help others. Now if I am not positive myself about it, how am I going to take any man whose feet are on a slippery foundation, and get him on solid ground.

Recently while I was gone I had an experience that was very encouraging to me. There came to our camp-meeting at Portland, Oregon a woman with children, who was a Roman Catholic. She had come in contact with our people there through one of our believers who had rendered her help that made her favorable to listen to what he might say, and he invited her to come to the meeting and she came and listened. I talked on the two phases, from the basis of personal experience, and then the message as presented in prophecy, night after night on the book of Daniel. We began Tuesday evening. Sabbath morning we called upon the people for a response and that woman came right forward and took her place with those who requested prayers and giving themselves to God.

Afterward she wanted to talk to me. She said, I have been

raised in the Catholic faith. As a Catholic, I have not been taught the Bible. The priest only takes up the catechism. I am not acquainted with the Bible and I could not prove the things that you have presented. But since I have come onto this ground, I have received such a personal blessing and such personal help that I believe you have the truth.

Now, I think that conviction ~~is~~ was greater than logical argument could be. It was sufficient to lead her right there to renounce her church and join this movement. It was not because we had gone all through the doctrines logically, proved everything out of the Bible, but because of a blessing that came into her soul. Now there is a conviction you and I ought to have personally to bring to others. Now I want to deal with these facts. It took me some time to get them clearly.

The gospel is the gospel of God concerning His Son, Jesus Christ. Rom. 1:1-3. Now we read yesterday that he was manifested, the Son of God was manifested to human eyes, manifested by taking our flesh, becoming a man among men. That was his incarnation.

I place the deity of Christ as absolutely fundamental. I must not lose my anchor through the Deity of this person. Then he became man. The incarnation of this person. He died for our sins, the atoning death of that person. He was raised from the dead. "Except he is raised from the dead, our faith is vain, our preaching is vain." He ascended into heaven. It was not a deceptive vision that these men had. It was an actual fact. He is ⁱⁿ heaven as a person now. He is in the heavenly sanctuary the same person with a body just as really as you and I have a body. He is doing a definite work. He appears before the face of God for us as our representative. Now when I think about

it that way, there is something real about having a Saviour. But when it is a mere figure of the imagination, a composite photograph of some men, that is no strength to me.

Now he is coming ~~me~~ back again as a person. This same Jesus. That is his earthly name. "This same Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." He is coming back for us. "In my father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have ~~and~~ told you. I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." "And so shall we ever be with the Lord." That will be an eternal association with that person. I rest my whole weight upon that foundation. And that becomes to me an absolute fact, absolute reality. And the preaching of the gospel is not to persuade people to agree with me in my theological views. The preaching of the gospel so far as I am concerned is to bring people into personal association with that person with whom I have fellowship.

I find when I deal with such things as this, I do not get away from the Spirit of Prophecy. It struck me with great force when I came to this paragraph one day:

"O that I could command language of sufficient force to make the impression that I wish to make upon my fellow-laborers in the gospel. My brethren, you are handling the words of life; you are dealing with minds that are capable of the highest development. Christ crucified, Christ risen, Christ ~~ascending~~ ascended into the heavens, Christ coming again, should so soften, gladden, and fill the mind of the minister that he will present these truths to the people in love and deep earnestness. The minister will then be lost sight of, and Jesus will be made manifest." Gospel Workers. p.159.

Now that does not exactly catalog all my seven divisions, but it made me pretty sure that I was on the right track when I did catalog

them.

Now to crystallize this thing in such a way that it will be real personal experience and mold our reaching, our preaching, our reading, & that is what I would like,---not deal with this now as one more theory that he has presented to us to think about. If this is worthy anything at all it is worth giving very earnest attention to, and if it has any influence upon your experience as it has upon mine, it will reverse the whole way of looking at things in our teaching and preaching. And we need not say in that that it will take away from us the special message for this time. There is nothing that has made the message so sure to me as when I have viewed it from this standpoint. Now let us take it up,---that idea that what we are to deal with is a fact, an absolute fact, and present a real person, and that our experience depends upon our personal relation to him. It all of course is bound up in the statement of the apostle Paul "that I may know Him." But we have to know the way that we can deal with him, not simply a name, Christ, but facts concerning him that will enable us to know him.

We have read Scriptures concerning the Christ manifested, that he was the Son of God in a unique sense different from that in which we are said to be children of God, but in that unique sense that makes him equal with God. That is our foundation of confidence, that he is able to save to the uttermost them that come to him. Able to save to the uttermost because of his very being. That is what gives force to all that he said, all that he did is his being, and that is founded in this idea of his deity. We read of that yesterday as a revelation of God, and that he himself took that position as the Son of God in a special sense.

Now we come to the question of his manifestation as the son of man, the incarnation. It is a truth that we need to live with for some time. We can only indicate, we can only suggest, but you

take that question of the incarnation of the Son, I have been greatly interested in going back of the time when he was manifested as a man in the flesh, and see manifestations earlier ~~than~~ manifestations. I have found what seemed to me to be clearly seven at least in creature form before he was born of a woman. I made a list of them, they are called Theophanies.

Gen. 1:18. He appeared to Abram.

" 33:24-30. He appeared to Jacob and wrestled with him.

Ex. 24:9-11. To Moses and the elders.

Joshua 5:13-15. As captain of the hosts of Israel. He was the Captain of salvation then as now. It was a question of salvation from their enemies. He gave them instruction how to gain the victory then, as now.

Judges 6:11-24. To Manoah.

" 13:3,6,9,18-20. To Gideon.

Dan. 3:24,25. He was with the three faithful men in the fiery furnace.

n

~~xxxxxx~~

Here are at least seven instances where it appears from Scripture that he appeared in creature form and dealt directly with humanity. But the great thing that we deal with is when he took our flesh permanently, because that is the prominent thing. That is the whole basis, the pledge of our success as Christians, it is the basis of our pledge of eternal life,—that He has taken our flesh, to keep it to all eternity. He has united himself with humanity for an eternal relation, taken humanity upon himself for all eternity.

Now here is the question we must all decide. By nature we were born in the first Adam, our line of descent is in the first Adam. Our whole choice is whether we shall accept that descent, that birth, and stay there and take the consequences of it, or whether we shall take our place in the last Adam, and take the consequences. I make that a real definite matter of choice. I am not condemned because the first Adam sinned, I am not judged for that. When Christ took our flesh and died on the cross, he settled that whole matter about the first Adam and his sin, and I am not condemned for that. "I will send another Comforter unto you, and when he is come he will

convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin not because they are in that Adam, but because they believed not on Him. That is the all-inclusive sin, because they believe not on him. We are condemned in the judgment, not because Adam sinned, but because we reject Christ, and persist ourselves in Adam's sin.

Now let us read some Scriptures, a sweep from Genesis 3 to Revelation 22, as a series of mountain peaks of the incarnation.

Genesis 3:15. "He shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." A.R.V. I like very much to use the personal pronoun as it is used in the Revised version. Right from the first gospel promise our attention is directed in a special way to a person. This person is the seed of a woman. That involves the incarnation.

Gal. 4:4. "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law."

I want to direct my mind to the thought that he was born of the flesh, just as I am born of the flesh.

Luke 2:11. "For there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord."

Rev. 22:16. "I Jesus have sent Mine angel to testify unto them you these things for the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright, the morning star."

Matthew 8

W WPRESCOTT

The glory of God is revealed in the face of Jesus Christ.

Luke 2:11: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord."

See how this scripture enters into the details.

Gal. 4:4: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law."

Here we have the definite facts concerning it. Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour who is Christ the Lord. Born, BORN of a woman. That brings him right into our family. It is a wonderful truth, to stop and think about that, that Christ, the Lord, Deity, the only begotten Son of God, came right into our family.

Luke 2:11 puts a new thought into that, and emphasizes the greatness of it. He who was born of a woman is Christ the Lord, the Saviour. He is the Saviour to us because he was born of a woman. If he had not been born of a woman he would not be our saviour. He was one with us. He carried that right along in this way until he said I ascend to my Father and your Father, to your God and my God. If his Father is my Father, and my Father is his Father, then he is my Brother.

Think of it as fact, and not as theology. Here is a man, standing right with men, and he says, I go to your Father and my Father, your Father and my Father, and we know that he came down from heaven. There is a wonderful thing there, that coming down to us from Heaven, being born here he became definitely related to us.

Rev. 22:16: "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star."

See the significance of the name he assumed. He didn't say I, the Lord of glory, after this manifestation to the world. The world can't deal with anything that isn't visible. After he had gone back he said, I, Jesus, I, Jesus. He is still Jesus (Amen) Now you take that in Genesis 3:15, which brings before us the person in the whole gospel, "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Victory through suffering. When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law. The definite thing, not the mere fact, but the definite event. Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour who is Christ the Lord. Go right to the last statement from heaven, after he had been manifested in the world and gone back, "I Jesus." There's the whole sweep from Genesis to Revelation. In the light of that sweep we can read the whole Bible on that point.

I wanted to call your attention to some scriptures that we won't take time to read, but first we will read two more scriptures.

Matt. 3:20: "And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head."

This is the first time that the "Son of Man" is used in the New Testament. None of the disciples used this expression in addressing him. He only used it of himself. Of course it goes right back to Daniel 7, "Behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near

before him." "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Here is the first time that the phrase is used in the New Testament and what picture does it present to us? A homeless man of poverty. Poorer than the poorest.

Rev. 14:14: "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle."

This is the last use of that phrase in the New Testament, and what is the picture? A glorious king, but it is the same king with a crown on his head, coming to take his kingdom. Between that first mention of a homeless man of poverty, not even a place to lay his head, worse than the birds and foxes, because they have a place, down to the very depths of poverty, that is the first time he calls himself the Son of Man. From that we pass on until the same Son of Man comes as the king of kings and Lord of lords. There are several things that follow through that, and one notable thing is that his pathway from that condition of the deepest poverty, the humblest position, to his being crowned as king, his pathway was by the cross. We must not forget that. I will give you some scriptures, but we will not take time to read them, showing that he passed through the crucial experience of his life as the Son of man. There is a significance there. These experiences deal especially with the crisis of his life. Remember that more space is devoted in the gospels to the experiences of the last week of Christ than to any other week of his life, and there is a significance in that fact of emphasis. These experiences have to do with the closing part of his life.

[The following texts were then given out]

Matt. 20:18, Matt. 26:2, John 3:4, Mark 9:31, Matt. 17:9
John 6:62, Mark 16:19, Revelation 1:12-15, Matt. 24:30, Matt. 25:31.

Those scriptures all deal with his experiences as the Son of Man. Why? I have said that the gospel is the good tidings concerning a person that has been manifested and known, a historical person, and certain very striking facts about that person. Here are some of the striking facts about that person. Our experience depends upon our personal relation to that person, and to these facts about him. I mean like this. We will study it more, but I would like to get this picture before our minds to think about as a whole. Our personal experience depends upon our relation to this person, and these facts concerning this person. He had these experiences as the Son of Man. We are to enter into those experiences. That is, we are to die with him. Until we are willing to do that, we won't get any further. Just as the pathway to heaven for that Son of Man was by way of the cross, our pathway is by way of the cross. There is no other way, and there is one of the fundamental things about him. We have to enter into that experience of death with him, and if we don't, the rest does not follow. Here is the cross right in the way, and if we come up to it and try to step around it to heaven, we lose our way to heaven right there, because we can't find any other way. And if I try to step around that experience of death, I will be lost in the wilderness of this world. That is very fundamental as an experience.

Just to run over it. We must enter into his experience of death. We must die with him. We must be raised with him. We must

ascend with him. We must enter into his experience of ministry with him, and we must thus be ready to sit on the throne with him. Those are facts. That is fact. And to get away from that into the realm of theoretic^{al} theology is to lose our way as Christians. Our personal experience depends upon our relationship to those facts about that person, and in this very definite way. He was born of the flesh; we must be born again. He died; we must die with him. He was raised; we must be raised with him. He ascended to heaven; we must ascend with him. As the high priest in the heavenly sanctuary ministering, we must enter into that ministry with him, as the mediator of the new covenant. If we don't enter into that experience, all our ministry is very profitless. He sits on the throne, and his word to us is, "He that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne." Those are absolute facts, and the question with us as Christians is, Are we entering into those facts with him? As absolute fact now, not as to whether we assent to this statement as being according to the Bible. That all has its place, but the vital question is our personal relation to him and to those facts.

Thursday, July 10, 10 A.M. Two Covenants

22.

512

A.G. DANIELLS: The subject now is the two covenants, to be presented by Brother Tait.

R.V.
A. O. TAIT: 2 Cor. 3:4-6: "Such confidence have we through Christ to Godward; not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to account anything as from ourselves; but our sufficiency is from God; who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

the
Now, we are ~~not~~ ministers of a new covenant. Our sufficiency is of God. We are not sufficient of ourselves. I confess, brethren, at the outset that I do not know how to present all these things in this covenant question that some of the brethren seem to think are necessary to ~~bringing~~ bring into it, but when he makes us the ministers of a new covenant, I turn to His word to find what that new covenant is, and it seems to be a very simple, clear, statement of truth that any child may understand. Turn now to Heb. 8:10:

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord;" That is very plain, simple and direct: "This is the covenant that I will make." If He will tell us in what follows things that are plain and clear to us, we may understand what the ~~new~~ covenant is, that God wishes us to be ministers of:

"After those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen, and every man his brother, saying Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest of them. For I will be merciful to their iniquities, and

their sins will I remember no more." That is a quotation from the 31st chapter of Jeremiah, as we all know.

The new covenant that we are to be ministers of places Gods law in the heart, ~~xxxxxx~~ or, rather, God says, "I will put my laws in their minds and on their hearts will I write them." We will not only learn the ten commandments with the mind, but those commandments will be received into the affections of the heart by the power of God, so that we will love to do God's will. God puts it there, and that gives us power to do it.

Then He says, "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." God himself comes right into the life, takes possession of the soul, --not only puts the law into the mind, but writes upon the heart so that the individual may have the power to lead the divine life, and then, for our encouragement, he tells us that He will be merciful to our iniquities, and that our sins will be remembered no more.

In the final fulfillment of this closing new covenant relation, when our sins are blotted out through the mediatorial work of Christ, in the sanctuary, no sin that we have ever committed will be remembered again in all the universe of God. They are blotted out and gone, so that we do not have to stand in the presence of our heavenly Father as culprits, but as men and women that have been redeemed through the blood of Christ, and that are in harmony with His great law, and have that law in our hearts and are sons and daughters of God.

I ~~xxxxxx~~ understand that is the new covenant. This new covenant, as we learn from the 3d chapter of Galatians, the 15th to the 17th verses, was given to Abraham 400 years before we came to Sinai;

And we know, of course, if we study the question further than we will take time to study it this morning, that the new covenant came in through the assurance of Christ right at the beginning.

This new covenant that was given to Abraham,--we find the first mention of that in connection with Abraham in the 15th of Genesis and the 18th verse, where he promises that He will make a covenant with him: "In that day Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, ~~xxxxxx~~ There is where he begins to talk about the promise to the seed that the Apostle Paul comments upon in his scripture. But the 17th chapter of Genesis gives more in detail this story of the covenant, and we will just gather from this a few thoughts.

of Gen. 17

The first 21 verses, especially are given up to this covenant question. In the 7th verse it says: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee." That is the covenant with Abraham through Christ. He said, "Not unto seeds, as of many, as but as of one, and that is Christ.

In this same verse he speaks of it as an everlasting covenant. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee."

Don't you see how the covenant given to Abraham here is _____ in the new covenant that we have read about in the 8th chapter of Hebrews? "I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. All through these first 21 verses he is speaking about the promise to the seed.

Again in the 13th verse he speaks of this covenant as being an everlasting covenant, and then in the 18th verse,--"I will establish

BPF

19

7-10

my covenant ~~xx~~ with him [that is, Isaac] for an everlasting covenant for his seed after him." "My covenant will I establish with Isaac. Over and over again we have references showing how God was continually calling up this covenant all through the Israelitish wanderings, and referring to the covenant he had made with Abraham and with Isaac and with Jacob,--this wonderful covenant that gives us the law of God in our hearts through the power of God and of Christ.

We have the old covenant spoken of in the 19th of Exodus, verses 5-8:

"Now therefore, ~~x~~ if he will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and set before them all these ~~ix~~ words which Jehovah commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that Jehovah hath spoken we will do."

No man has any right to make any such promise as that, because there is no man in his own strength that can keep the law of God and do all these things. The only way that can be done is for the Christ himself to come into the life and take possession of the individual, and live the life of God and keep the law of God in the individual by His divine power. But they said, "All that Jehovah hath spoken we will do."

In the presence of great, overpowering influences we know from our own experience that we are led to make great resolutions. We will form strong resolutions, and we will say that we will do so and so; that never again will I do this wrong thing that I have done. And

at that particular moment we thought we could carry them out; but the first thing we knew we slid right back into the same place we were in before, and found ourselves doing those things that we were doing before, because we have undertaken to do that in the strength of some great resolution or of a powerful will. But we need the will of Christ himself in our lives, living these things out for us. We cannot do it ourselves.

The old covenant, as we find in Ex: 24:7, 8, was ratified and the same promise was repeated. "He took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, All that Jehovah hath spoken will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which Jehovah hath made with you concerning all these words."

It has been the characteristic of humanity all the way through his course of sin to try to save himself. We do not like to give up to the idea that we can not do anything good. We do not like to yield to the inevitable on that point. Humanity from the beginning all the way through has continued to make the effort to save himself. And there were Israelites, or people belonging to the Israelitish nation, who were not Israelites, who were doing that all through their career and undertaking and promising to do things that they were absolutely unable to do.

(A.O. TAIT--Cont'd)

This Old Covenant was ratified by the blood of these animals; and the people said, "We will do that. We will obey." But as we study the question in the Bible we find but very little made of that old covenant in comparison with what is said of the new covenant that was given to Abraham. Let us turn to the third chapter of Galatians and read verses 15 to 18: (Reading)

"Brethren I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man(s covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulbeth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise."

Now Paul goes right back to the Abrahamic covenant and the Abrahamic promises to find the salvation promised to the seed through Christ. It seems to me that that makes it very plain and clear.

Now there is a point or two I would like to call your attention to concerning this Abrahamic covenant, in Genesis 26:5. "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Then Abraham had kept God's law. He had this specification of the new covenant because he was able to keep God's law.

Then here in the 3rd chapter of Galatians verses 6-14 there is a further statement in regard to this arrangement with Abraham:

"Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith; but The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

These scriptures very plainly carry us back to that Abrahamic covenant through the seed, which was Christ. And he says that the law which was given 430 years after does not disannul the promises that were given before..

The covenant of works, or the Old Covenant which the people promised they would obey, was ratified by the blood of animals. It seems to me when we reach that point in the history of the world-- and it has been true every since the entry into the world of sin-- that "evil men and seducers have been waxing worse and worse"--the race has been going down--so that God has to change his plan to ^{changing} meet the conditions of man from time to time. His plan at that time had to be amplified and drawn out into more seremony in order to attract the people and to meet the needs down in Moses time; and so God gives them a covenant. He ratifies that covenant by the blood of animals, that through the death of these animals they might look forward to the death of Christ. Moses did it, Joshua did it, Abraham did it, others did it. They looked forward through the blood of these animals to the One who would ratify the true covenant, the new covenant under which he himself came, and of which we are the ministers at present. ^{In those times} They might have looked forward and got a vision of the Cross, but they did not catch that vision. They simply saw ceremonials. They were looking to some work that they could do. They would offer the blood of an animal; ~~they fixaklyxgaxaxthaxthax~~ ~~wasixixaxaxaxertixexaxaxax~~ They looked upon the ark of the covenant as a sort of mascot that would bring them out of difficulties, and bring victory to them. But God had to keep leading them continually to show them that it was by their works but by his promises that he would plant his law in their hearts, that they would be able to stand.

~~ret~~

The new covenant is a covenant of faith. We have seen how in the first part of Galatians third chapter that Abraham received the righteousness of Christ by faith, and then the 21 and 23 verses say that the scripture shut up all things under sin that the promises of faith in Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. Now we must believe in the Christ. We must have him come into our lives as the living personal Christ that he is if we are to obey the terms of the new covenant.

Three of the Evangelists--Matthew, Mark, Luke, mention the ratification of the new covenant. We will read only in Matthew (26th chapter, 28th verse.) "For this is my blood of the new testament (covenant--R.V.), which is shed for many for the remission of sins." I like the word "covenant" used in the Revised Version better, The Master is saying to them and to us that all through the old dispensation they have been looking forward to the Lamb of God that should be slain for the sins of the world. They have been looking forward through sacrifices of animals to the great Sacrifice. "You have seen how that old covenant was ratified by the blood of bulls and goats," he says, "but now is come the supreme moment when the new covenant is to be ratified by the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ himself." And so in the room there with his disciples he gives them the cup and says, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for you." "That back yonder was typical. It had its place, but now the supreme sacrifice is about to be made and that which was typified by these sacrifices back there is about to become the reality, and the new

HBM

25
W/

7-10

covenant is now about to be ratified in my own blood."

I like to read the references the Apostle Paul makes to this
 vs. 23-25
 in the 11th chapter of First Corinthians. "I received of the Lord
 that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the
 same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had
 given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body,
 which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me." "This
 cup is the new covenant in my blood" The Lord Jesus Christ
 poured out his life completely for us in the ratification of
 the new covenant in order to make it possible for ~~maxxxxxxxx~~
~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ the Father's love that had been taken away from
 us by sin, to be brought back into our lives again, not only
 inscribed on our minds but enshrined in our hearts by the power of
 the precious blood of the wonderful Christ our Saviour.

Now the keeping of the law is vital in both covenants.
 Let us turn to the 4th chapter of Deuteronomy, the 13th verse.
 (I believe, brethren, that we sometimes, in the place of pre-
 senting the real vital thing in this covenant--in order to
 meet some objector we sometimes fail to ^{get} ~~give~~ the beautiful power
 there is in this teaching.) "And he declared unto you his own
 covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments;
 and he wrote them upon two tables of stone. Now there is a
 covenant commanded. There is a covenant we are to perform. It
 is found in the ten commandments, and it is written upon two
 tables of stone. So there is no evading the question as to just
 what that refers to. Now the object of the ^{new} covenant is that that
 law which was engraven upon two tables of stone shall be engraven

HBM

25-9

7-10

522

upon our hearts. That was what the people promised in the old dispensation they would do; but God promised it in the new covenant that he would do it for them--that which they were not able to obey--which it was impossible for them to work out themselves.

A O TAIT: So we find the ark called the ark of the covenant in numerous passages. Numbers 10:33 and 1 Kings 8:31 are two passages. And the whole process, all the way through, from whichever angle you study it, shows the supreme importance of the law of God, that the law of God is to be brought back into the souls and minds of men. But man of himself could not do those things. God taught that to ancient Israel. Read that text in Zechariah, a familiar one, the seventh chapter and the twelfth verse: "Yea, they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in his spirit by the former prophets: therefore came a great wrath from the Lord of hosts." Now the individual who will hear the law by the spirit of God as God sends it by the form of a prophet, gets a Christ in connection with that law, and will get a power with it that will enable him to observe that law, because it will be enshrined in his heart. But "they made their hearts as an adamant stone" lest the law would come into their lives. Then we have that familiar text in the seventeenth of Jeremiah, where the heart is deceitful above all things and so desperately wicked that man of himself cannot know it. And then the one in the thirteenth of Jeremiah and the twenty-third verse where he tells us that the leopard cannot change his spots nor the Ethiopian his skin, no more can men who are devoted to sin change their lives or their characters, and so those who try to change their own lives are trying to work as those men did under the old covenant back there. They saw Jehovah there upon the mountain, and they felt as though they had power to make that promise, but even while the cloud of glory was still hovering over the mount, they went away and committed

that terrible sin of making the golden calf. So we see the futility of trying to do these things without Christ himself.

Now we will not have time to study as we might study, but I wish to suggest in connection with this study of the new covenant, especially the eighth to the twelfth chapters of Hebrews. It tells the story there,, and I wish to get a view of those points brought out.

of

In the first verse of the eighth chapter he says that the things we are saying the chief point is this, significance or doctrine of the priesthood. Then he brings in the question of what the new covenant is, quoting from the thirty-first of Jeremiah, saying that the covenant is established upon better promises, and finding fault with them he said, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Then in the ninth chapter he speaks of the ark of the covenant, and brings in many important points there with which we are familiar. And the twelfth verse, "Nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption. For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." It is the blood of Christ that will cleanse our conscience from dead works, to serve the living God, and for this cause he is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of transgressions that were under the first

covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance." Now he enters into the two covenants, and shows how the one of which we are to receive is to come through the promise of the blood of the Christ himself.

Tenth chapter: "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh. Else would they not have ceased to be offered? because the worshippers, having been once cleansed, would have had no more consciousness of sins." I like to hang upon that verse. When we are cleansed through the blood of Christ, the consciousness of sin dies out, the consciousness of the power of the divine life comes in to take its place, and we are looking forward into the great life of power that comes through our Lord Jesus Christ himself. Now he says, "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." Some of those people trusted in it, and the whole heathen world got into the habit of offering sacrifice in order that they might deliver themselves from their difficulties, and the Israel who kept under the old covenant followed that same view. "Wherefore when he cometh into the world he saith." Now he quotes from the fortieth Psalm, and I would like to turn and read that, because there is a little more in the Psalm than there is here.

"Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I am come; in the roll 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 in the great assembly."

Now let us get the picture there. Mankind has been trying to do things through his own power, and by his own strength try to keep the law by working along through it, and making a failure of it, with only a man here and there catching a vision of its meaning, like Abraham, and Moses, who looked forward to him who is to come. Now here comes a supreme moment when he fulfills this promise, and when he comes, he says In the roll of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God, yea thy law is within my heart. Mankind could not keep the law by himself; God sends his son to this earth with His law enshrined in his heart, and then sends that Son into our lives with his Father's law in his own heart, that he may live through us the life that we cannot possibly live ourselves. How beautifully and wonderfully this is stated in the twentieth verse of Revelation three, "Behold I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." I like to think of that scripture and these that we have read, in this light, that when Christ comes into our lives, that he brings in his own heart his father's law, and he brings with him the power that we may live that law and do the life that Jesus Christ himself lived. Humanity is not equal to the occasion, it requires divine power.

A G DANIELLS: The next topic will be The 1260 Years of Daniel 7, presented by Brother Premier.

[Brother Premier presented the chart and read the outline that follows]

H. S. PREMIER, on the 1260 DAYS

I would like to read several quotations from "Great Controversy." The first is from page 54, the second paragraph:

"In the sixth century the papacy had become firmly established. Its seat of power was fixed in the imperial city, and the bishop of Rome was declared to be the head over the entire church. Paganism had given place to the papacy. The dragon had given to the beast ~~his power, and his seat, and great authority.~~ 'his power, and his seat, and great authority.' And now began the 1260 years of papal oppression foretold in the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation."

Page 55: "The accession of the Roman Church to power marked the beginning of the Dark Ages."

Here you see the thought of power, spiritual power, of a system, not necessarily monarchical, but a spiritual system and a persecuting power.

Page 266; third paragraph: "The periods here mentioned--'forty and two months,' and 'a thousand two hundred and threescore days'--are the same, alike representing the time in which the church of Christ was to suffer oppression from Rome. The 1260 years of papal supremacy began with the establishment of the papacy in A.D. 538, and would therefore terminate in 1798."

Fourth paragraph: "The persecution of the church did not continue throughout the entire period of the 1260 years. God in mercy to his people cut short the time of their fiery trial. In foretelling the 'great tribulation' to befall the church, the Saviour said, 'Except those days should be shortened,' and so on.

Page 306: (End of third line) "The ~~1260~~ 1260 years of papal persecution, concerning which he had promised that the tribulation

power was to oppress God's people. This period, as stated in preceding chapters, began with the establishment of the papacy, A. D. 538, and terminated in 1798."

W. W. PRESCOTT: You understand that there was no papacy before 538 and no papacy since 1798?

PRENIER: No, we understand that temporal power was temporarily taken from the papacy in 1798.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Was it?

H.S.PRENIER: I believe we can understand that better as we go on in this study.

Professor Prenier then introduces the "South Lancaster Academy Bible Notes" on "Time Prophecies," from which he quotes largely.

See next page:

THREE P.M. SESSION

530

E R PALMER: It seems to me that we should not leave the subject matter of the eleventh of Daniel as it is, but that there should be further presentation of it. Much time has been given to the consideration of the new view, and very little time to the presentation of the view that has generally been held among us. I move that a committee of three, made up of Professor Wilkinson, Professor Sorenson and Professor Longacre, be appointed to arrange for the further presentation of the old view, and that they be given such time as they may require in the forenoon of next Monday to present the results of their study.

[This motion was seconded]

W W PRESCOTT: I would like to suggest along with it, that if the brethren can also do so, that they give attention to the propositions of Brother Wilcox.

A G DANIELLS: You mean to that list of statements?

W W PRESCOTT: Yes.

A G DANIELLS: That could be included. Did you think best to limit that presentation?

E R PALMER:

W-W-PRESCOTT: I did not have that in mind, but rather that a definite time should be set apart, as much as is necessary.

[The motion was carried]

A G DANIELLS: The meeting now is to consider the study given this morning. I would like to ask Professor Prescott if he would state to us the difference or the changes of the meaning he attaches to the Saviour as Lord, Son, Christ, and Jesus, that is, those different names. I have observed that he places emphasis

upon the use of these names in different places like in Revelation where the Saviour said I am Jesus, and than in other places. It seemed to me that if we could have a statement right through brought together, it would help us to understand it better, and we could get in the records.

W W PRESCOTT: Perhaps we can do this best by reading some scriptures. In acts 3:36, after referring to what David said concerning him in the 31st verse, that Christ did not see corruption, he says: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."

The Christ, the Messiah. He was talking about the anointed one. The Revised Version often introduces the definite article, as you see. "The resurrection of the Messiah."

Thirty-second verse: "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses." Back in the 22nd verse he spoke of him as Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you." He has told of his crucifixion now, and he applies what David said, this Jesus of Nazareth, this man, did God raise up, "Whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear.. For David ascended not into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, Till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet. Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."

They crucified Jesus the man of Nazareth. God in raising him up made him both Lord and Christ. He brought testimony to that fact. Therefore when the apostles went out to preach, they preached those two phases. Acts 5:42: "And every day, in the temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ." That is one phase. 2 Cor. 4:4: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake." There are the two phases. "He hath made this Jesus," this man of Nazareth, the events concerning him, what God did for that man Jesus of Nazareth has made him both Lord and Christ. If he had remained in the tomb he would not have been the Messiah spoken of in the prophecy, nor Lord, but now, as Peter says to Cornelius, He is Lord of all. Does that suggest any answer to what you want?

A G DANIELLS: Hardly. David called him Lord. Well, he was Lord before he came. He was Son before he came. But he was not Christ? Or was he Christ and Jesus before he came. These were those terms used of him. Was he called by those names? What do they signify?

W W PRESCOTT: Take "Jesus." "Jesus" emphasizes his name as a man. This Jesus of Nazareth, a man. "There is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." Both terms are used here, because he is proved to be the Messiah. The name itself, "They shall call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins:" I think I suggested that that name Jesus, in Greek, is just the same as Joshua, so we have it in Hebrews 4. Now the word

is the Greek form of the contract Hebrew y'hosea, but that letter y that is in our English there to sort of ~~reemine~~ Romanize it, is the same as what we have in the Psalms Jah, which is a contract for Jehovah; so when you get the word all together, it is Jehovah-osea, which is briefly Jehovah, salvation.

F M WILCOX: When the birth was pronounced, "They shall call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from theirsins," is there any of that meaning in the original meaning of the word?

W W PRESCOTT: That is what I was just giving. Jehovah, saviour.

C SLONGACRE: Was he recognized as Christ before he was baptized and anointed?

W W PRESCOTT: We read that Moses esteemed the reproaches of Christ of greater riches than the riches of Egypt. I confess I don't know how to use that unless it is used of that person who is now anointed and became the Messiah.

M C WILCOX: I have been told that it comes in the Psalms in the original, the "anointed One."

W W PRESCOTT: Yes. You take it in the second Psalm, and in Daniel 9.

F M WILCOX: Sometimes it is said that Moses was saved through faith in the Saviour to come. Was he not saved by a present Saviour there with him, just the same as we are saved?

W W PRESCOTT: I think so. And yet there had not been the same manifestations of that person, and the same fulness of the revelation of the gospel as we have now.

A G DANIELLS: I don't know as you quite get it. What is the difference between Jesus and Christ in the meaning of those two

words. Why should you place emphasis upon the scripture which says, I am Jesus. Why not I am Christ?

W W PRESCOTT: When the word Jesus is used that way, it brings up and emphasizes the human side of that person.

A G DANIELLS: That is what I wanted to get at.

W W PRESCOTT: When Christ is used it represents the anointing of that person as the Messiah. Sometimes you see the words Christ Jesus, and sometimes Jesus Christ. While I wouldn't be prepared to demonstrate it in every case, yet I think when the two words are used the word used first is the more emphasized one in that connection.

F M

W W WILCOX: It would indicate the human and the divine in him.

W W PRESCOTT: That would indicate that man of Nazareth, who by his anointing and his resurrection is the Messiah.

W W WILCOX: There are some that render Jesus "The Anointed."

W W PRESCOTT: We have in Luke the second chapter --

CAVINESS: I am glad for the distinction, for I recently had a letter from a sister who was troubled about the preexistence of Jesus. ~~It~~ She said the Bible talks about the Son of God before the incarnation, but she couldn't understand that of Jesus. So I decided the trouble was over the names. That He did preexist, not as Jesus, but as the Son of God.

LACEY: Isn't Michael his prehuman name?

G.B. THOMPSON: I want to ask a question. The Son ^{is} eternal. You argue from that his deity and eternal existence. We know there are three persons ~~a~~ in the Godhead, and Paul speaks about the eternal Spirit. What about the eternal existence of the third person?

PRESCOTT: It is plainly said there, isn't it? You wouldn't place a beginning to the spirit. They are eternal. God, and the Spirit.

DANIELLS: Another thing I thought we might spend a minute on. It is really a quiz, but yet it has to do with this line. It is our use of the name of God and His Son in our preaching and conversation and all. I have thought of it a great many times, and I have wondered if there was a way of a more reverent use of these names. Now sometimes I hear our own speakers speak of God Almighty. That always grates on me. It is a kind of shock to me. Of course He is God, and he is ~~x~~ Almighty, but as I have thought of it, it seemed to me that there is a note of irreverence about it.

BOLLMAN: Isn't it more in the manner in which ~~is~~ it is said?

DANIELLS: Yes. It seems to me that we might speak of the Almighty God, or the Almighty One, the Omnipotent One. Then too, I have heard some preachers use the two names, Jesus Christ so often and flippantly,--or if I shouldn't use that word, carelessly, in

a talk. I don't like to combine the two. I know they are in the Bible, but we are such careless people that I think as a body of ministers and teachers, we might give a little study to the reverent use of the names of the Deity.

M.C.WILOOX: I read not long ago a Catholic writer who spoke of the irreverence of the Protestants in speaking of the Deity. The Catholic way is "Our Lord".

DANIELLS: You cannot help noticing that in their literature. Of course they have the form, but isn't it right for us to have the form and the Spirit both? And having the spirit, of reverence, to express that spirit by the use of language? So I believe that somehow

we ought to sound a note on that, either through our papers or in some of our institutes or somewhere, and with the reverence we do feel for God, manifest and express that reverence in the use of the names and the manner, the tone of voice and all, in which we use them. I think it would be a proper thing when we are speaking to a crowd of people and use the name of God, Christ, or Jesus, to give it a bit of expression that would convey in it a sense of reverence for the One whose name we use.

ANDERSON: What would you think of using "you" instead of "thou" in prayer?

DANIELLS: I have heard brethren use it, but I incline very strongly to the sacred form.

WAKEHAM: There is, somewhere in the Spirit of Prophecy, a place where that expression, "God Almighty" is expressly forbidden, and we are admonished not to use it.

VOICES: It is in Early Writings.

DANIELLS: It doesn't sound a bit like profanity with the

right expression and inflection, to speak of the Almighty God. Well, I don't know that I need to say more, but I have been impressed with the studies Brother Prescott has given, anew, with the difference of meaning of the names of the Deity, and I thought I would like to have a little emphasis put on that and then a suggestion with reference to greater reverence in our use of these names in preaching and in prayer, and in our talk as well.

FIELD: I offer this suggestion: I have made it a rule for myself in prayer, that I would try to follow the example of the Saviour in the Lord's prayer and say "Our Father". I teach my students reverence in the use of the names of God.

WAKEHAM: Here is the statement I had in mind. It is in EARLY WRITINGS page 122, the paragraph entitled "Irreverence". "I saw that God's holy name should be used with reverence and awe. The words "God Almighty" are coupled together and used in a careless, thoughtless manner displeasing to Him. Said the angel, couple them not together, for fearful is His name." A direct statement from the angel of God that they should not be coupled together.

DANIELLS: Now the teachers can do a great deal in bringing up the young men. You can do a great deal to encourage reverence in the use of these expressions.

WIRTH: Do you think it would be too stilted to say "The Christ"? That is the way it is in the original.

DANIELLS: You have heard the question. Would it be too stiff and stilted to speak of Jesus as "The Christ"? I never felt drawn that way.

PRESCOTT: The Scripture does not use it that way all the time, though it does occasionally.

C.B. THOMPSON: This question has been raised. Is it proper to pray to Christ or the Holy Spirit, or should we make our requests only to the Father in the name of the Son? Of course we have the Doxology which says gives praise to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but the Lord's Prayer is to our Father.

PRESCOTT: What is the last prayer in the Scripture?

VOICE: Come Lord Jesus.

DANIELLS: I have always felt, of course, the one to go to is the Father in the name of Jesus, but with the aid and help of the Holy Spirit, and it has always seemed to me when I come in that attitude and with that recognition, that in the course of earnest prayer,--free, earnest supplication, I have always felt as free then to address Jesus and even the Blessed Spirit and speak to them in the course of prayer, especially alone, as any other way. I have been drawn that way a great many times and do not know why one shouldn't.

PALMER: Is there any example of prayer being addressed to Christ or the Spirit, in the Bible? I have thought that one mentioned by Prof. Prescott is a message addressed to the church rather than a prayer addressed to a person. I wonder if there is an instance in the Scriptures where any other prayer is addressed.

WAKEHAM: I confess I was very much surprised when I saw in one of our periodicals a very severe criticism upon those who would address Jesus in prayer, and especially with reference to little children. To me, there is nothing more beautiful than to hear my little children lisp their thanks to Jesus, and I remember Stephen, when being stoned to death, his last words were "Lord Jesus receive my spirit", and in the face of that and other

statements, it seems to me it is ~~not~~ ^{not} only proper, ~~and~~ but most beautiful to address prayers to Jesus my Saviour. While I recognize of course, that ordinarily we speak to the Father in the name of Jesus, to restrict ourselves to that use is in my mind very unscriptural.

LACEY: The first instance of prayer in Acts seems to be to Jesus. It is in Acts 1st chapter. Peter is talking, in verses 21-22 and 24. "Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, Beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection". They are waiting for one to be chosen in the place of Judas and prayed to Jesus. 24th verse. "And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." Christ had chosen the other disciples, and they wanted him to chose that one. And why shouldn't they pray to Christ? Isn't he in the Godhead? Aren't we losing sight of the beautiful truth of the unity of the Godhead? Why can't we pray to the Son and the Holy Spirit just as to the Father? Brethren, the hymns we sing, unless they are just formal, are expressions of heartfelt praise both to the Father, to the Son, and the Spirit of God. Why can't we pray to the Son and the Spirit as well as to the Father?

(Discussion on the Two Covenants)

UNDERWOOD: There are two or three things I would like to emphasize in the covenants. I think the covenant question covers the entire Bible. It is a big question and no one can cover it in one or two hours or a day. I would like to speak of the New Covenant and emphasize one point. I understand the new covenant was made with Adam. . It was ~~firmly established~~ It was confirmed to Abraham by an oath. I would like to emphasize one point in the 15th chapter of Genesis, when God renewed or confirmed that covenant with an oath he asked Abraham to take an heifer and cut it up and get some doves, etc., and to walk between those parts and take a solemn oath of allegiance to the covenant. He took that oath; and I understand none can enter into the new covenant without taking a pledge,

We come into that covenant as aliens, and no government on earth will permit a person to come in and have the privileges of a citizen without taking an oath of allegiance. That was required, and I just want to read an extract from "Patriarchs and Prophets," page 137, where Sister White says, in describing Abraham walking between these parts: [The following has not been verified]

"This being done, he reverently passed between the parts of the sacrifice, making a solemn vow to God of perpetual obedience."

Sometimes we get the idea that when we make a vow to obey God, we have entered into the old covenant, and that is what the old covenant consists in. Far from it!

Now one more statement from the spirit of prophecy. In commenting on Ex. 19:18, Sister White says this in the Review and Herald of June 23, 1904: "And all the people answered together and said, All that the Lord hath spoken will we do." That is a quotation of that text. Then she makes this comment: "This is the pledge that God's people are to make in these last days. Their acceptance with God depends ~~on~~ on a faithful fulfillment of the terms of their agreement with Him. God includes in the covenant all who obey."

M.G. WILCOX: Is that what she elsewhere calls the baptismal vow?

R. A. UNDERWOOD: I do not know. I would like to emphasize, brethren, and to our teachers especially that are going out, that simply making a solemn vow to obey God and pledge eternal allegiance to his government is in keeping with, and in fact, a part of our new covenant relation with Jesus Christ. The fact that most of the Children of Israel trusted in themselves to carry out that covenant or pledge is another question. We do the same thing? But their pledge to obey God was very proper, and just what God asked

them to do. Caleb and Joshua made that pledge; and the record says they ~~went~~ went through into the promised land. When the others said that there were giants in the land, compared to which they were but as grasshoppers, Caleb said, "If God be with us, we are fully able to go in." He relied on God. The point I want to emphasize is that no one will get the idea that when a man makes a pledge to obey God he is going into the old covenant relations.

F. M. WILCOX: Do you understand that the old covenant had a national application as well as a spiritual? I have wondered if, in a national sense, you can say that the old covenant extended down to the time of Christ.

R. A. UNDERWOOD: Yes, it did. I will give you just two expressions here. In the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters of Hebrews, and after bringing in what our good brother referred to of those promises which take us over when every man shall know the Lord,—and that is away in the future,—and I like several translations when it says "able to make a new covenant. One reads "able to accomplish," and another "able to complete," carrying out the idea that the covenant began away back in the beginning, but was not complete, and it is not complete now. It was ratified on Christ, established forever, but it is not complete until all shall know the Lord, and that is when a lot of sinners will have perished, and there will not be anybody but what knows the Lord.

There is something more to the old covenant than simply the agreement. I want to read this statement from the first part of Hebrews 9: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary." As I understand the whole ceremonial law and the sacrificial system, a large amount of requirements of the people of God were simply offered as a schoolmaster or tutor to draw the mind back to

the everlasting covenant or the means of salvation. There was no salvation in the old covenant at all.

I want to just read a statement here. Our good brother in quoting in Galatians, used the verses there in the 3d chapter, up to the 18th verse, I want to just relate briefly a little experience that may help some of the younger men. I had in my hand a copy of a discussion by Elder J. H. Waggoner and Peter Vogel. That discussion was published in the Review and Herald, and also in the Christian Standard in 1873. Seven years after this I had to debate with Elder Vogel for three or four days, and he quoted some of the other verses which our brother did not touch. In the 19th verse, it says, "Wherefore serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made."

Elder Waggoner held the same view on that that his son Elliott held, and when they came in the debate to that question Elder Vogel quoted that verse, and then said that Christ has come, therefore the law has served out its time, and is discharged. And as Elder Waggoner held the same view, he did not reply to that at all. Elder Vogel said the law was, not is, our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we may be justified by faith.

When I debated with Elder Vogel, he used this same text, and I did ~~not~~ reply to it. Now, as to why Elder Waggoner did not touch it: In a testimony written in Switzerland in 1887, Sister White said: "I have something to address to Brother Waggoner and A. T. Jones. I have something to say to you that I should withhold no longer. I have been looking in vain for an article that was written nearly twenty years ago in reference to the 'added law.' I read this to Elder Waggoner, and I stated then to him that I had been shown that his position in regard to

the law was incorrect, and from the statement I made to him he has been silent upon the question for many years." When he debated with Peter Vogel, he was silent. That testimony was written to the old gentleman, J. H. Waggoner.

Just a word now with reference to the experience that I had with Elder Vogel. Of course I showed to him very clearly that the added law was a part of the old covenant, was added, not to the moral law, but added to the promise made to Abraham, and was to continue till the seed, Christ, should come; and I just want to read one statement from the spirit of prophecy right on that in closing:

"The distinction between the two systems is bright and clear. The ceremonial system was made up of symbols pointing to Christ, to His sacrifice, his priesthood. This ritual law, with its sacrifices and ordinances, was to be performed by the Hebrews, and type met antitype in the death of Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Then all the sacrificial offerings were to cease. It is this law that Christ took out of the way, nailing it to His cross."

I have had some of our students in our schools come to me and say that when they asked their Bible teachers about this, they said they could not tell whether it was the moral or the ceremonial law that was abolished. I think our teachers ought to be able to tell that.

new covenant

UNDERWOOD: This question of the ~~maxims~~ is a big question. The new covenant has the same specifications as the old, the only difference is that it is God who helps us to keep that covenant. If we try to keep the new covenant in our own strength, we are doing the same as those people back there. We have all got to make that solemn allegiance to obey the covenant. Only on these terms can God accept us.

PRESCOTT: The best definition I have ever found of the Covenant is on page 371 of Patriarchs and Prophets. It is one that has helped me most to get a clear view of this matter. It is there defined to be an arrangement for bringing men again into harmony with the divine will and placing them where they can obey God's law. Now just on the basis of that definition I want to add a little.

An arrangement for bringing men again into harmony with the divine will, and placing them where they could obey God's law. In the 3rd chapter of Second Corinthians, sixth verse it says, "Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Now, want to ask what that means-- to be ministers of the new covenant? The new covenant--an arrangement for bringing men into harmony with the divine will--placing them where they could obey God's law. We are to be ministers of this arrangement.

F.M.WILCOX : To represent in our own lives and teaching that provision of salvation.

PRESCOTT: We are ministers of the new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit. Let us turn to the 8th verse which contrasts this ministrations, "How shall not the ministrations

of the spirit be rather glorious?"

Now what is the arrangement? Hebrews 8:⁸10: (May I remark with reference to this quotation there are three different Greek words translated by the same expression in the English text. The first is in the 8th verse, "Behold the days come when I will make a new covenant." Here ~~ixix~~ the word "make" is rendered "accomplish". In the ninth verse it says, "Not according to the covenant I made", and the word "made" has a different rendering. Then in the 10th verse it is still another word that is given, the rendering being, "This covenant I will covenant". What I want especially to call your attention to is the rendering in the 10th verse, "This covenant I will covenant." That word translated "put", is the verb "to give". The new covenant is a gift.

Now turn to I Cor. 11:25: "In like manner (R.V.) also, the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood." What is the arrangement that will bring men into harmony with the divine will and make it possible for them to obey the law? the blood of Christ. That arrangement we may express in different terms, such as "the blood of Christ" "the spirit of Christ", "the Holy Spirit" or "the Person of Christ."

Now the new covenant is not the law. It is an arrangement to bring men so that they can obey the law (Amens). That arrangement is a personal arrangement. It is not an abstract idea. That person is Christ; but the death of Christ was absolutely necessary for that. So it is expressed as the blood of the covenant. Sometimes blood means death and sometimes it means life. I think here it means life. It is a life

arrangement. And if we are to be ministers of the new covenant we must minister to the people that arrangement--that life--that Person, or else the law that we deal with will be the old covenant affair after all. It is the same law. Now the difference between being ministers of the old covenant and ministers of the new will be that ~~we~~ we are actually ministers of that arrangement--and that arrangement centers in a Person and is the ministration of the Spirit.

I want to call attention to one or two other things with reference to this covenant which has not been referred to at all. It says, "They continued not in my covenant." Now there is a great deal in that expression. This Epistle to the Hebrews which is dealing with the priesthood of Christ and his ministry and comes up to this as a sort of climax--this putting the law in the heart--begins with the Person of Christ in the first chapter, and it says, "Thou continuest" contrasting him with the created things ~~that are~~. That expression refers to no definite time, beginning or ending, simply "thou continuest." Now in the old covenant that does not continue. Why, Because the same thing has been done with that that has been done about the Papacy.

W W PRESCOTT: They didn't have the continual. Do you get the idea, Brother Field? Why didn't they continue in the covenant? Because they didn't have the continual. Putting all doctrine as personality, who is the continual? Christ. That is why they didn't continue. They didn't have the continual, and that is not abstraction, that is the person, Christ. This work of the Papacy turns back the new covenant and makes it the old covenant, the carrying-away taking away of the continual, and that is why they didn't continue. Another thing in the ninth of Hebrews. I don't think there will be time now, but I would like to call your attention to this question of the use of the term covenant, and the use of the term testament, whether it makes any difference which one we use. But I don't think two or three minutes will be sufficient, so I will have to beg your indulgence another time.

I want to emphasize in Galatians 3 the gift idea that is there. (Verse 15) "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though it be but a man's covenant, yet when it hath been confirmed, no one maketh it void, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham were the promises (Here is the word promise) spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. Now this I say; A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect." I want you to notice the use of the words promise and covenant. "For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no more of promise: but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise." The word used here for granted is "Freely given." He has freely given it.

There is that idea of the gift by promise, and he uses the word promise sort of interchangeably with covenant.

W R FRENCH: Do we understand that the use of the plural word there would include two covenants made with Abraham?

W W PRESCOTT: Do you mean by that the old and new covenants? No. I don't understand it refers to the old covenant ~~there~~ there. He is referring to a gift, a promise. What I want to emphasize is that this arrangement includes the unspeakable gift. That is what I want to emphasize. It was not the law. The new covenant is not the law, it is an arrangement. That arrangement is a personal arrangement. It is a gift. It is a promise. The scripture uses a promise as equivalent to the thing promised. Peter says "having received the promise." The promise had in it the thing. This gift idea, this arrangement, is a personal gift, and the new covenant, in order for us to be ministers of the new covenant, we must be ministers of the life of Christ to the believer. Otherwise we will be ministers of the old covenant. We must be ministers of Christ; He is the ~~eternal~~ continual one. We must minister his life, his spirit, he is the power. Put one where he can obey the law, and he brings forth the fruits of righteousness.

ERESBETT: It appears to me after the presentation this morning, that there is a question that we need to consider back of this matter of the 1260 days. The question comes to me like this: whether it is an open question for historical study or whether we are shut off from historical study.

Now why I speak of that is this: I asked, you remember, this morning, whether we had any Papacy since 1798, because it was read to us that the Papacy was abolished in 1798. There came immediately an explanation of that meaning that it does not mean abolished. Well, I don't think it was abolished. But just as soon as you do that, I want the same privilege about some other words that are used,--the privilege of explaining their meaning in harmony with history and fact.

Now I don't want to stir up any trouble or make anybody think I am an apostate and a heretic, but I want to call your attention to a sample of this principle, that the author and editors of 'Great Controversy' have recognized the propriety of correcting statements when the facts have required it, and that without any attack upon the Spirit of Prophecy at all. This is their own work and not mine.

GREAT CONTROVERSY, page 224, at the top of the page the first statement in the old edition is: "On the day following its appearance, Henry Dana Ward wrote thus of the wonderful phenomenon:". The same paragraph in the revised edition reads: "In the New York Journal of Commerce of Nov. 14, 1852, appeared a long article regarding this wonderful phenomenon, containing this statement:". Why doesn't it say in the new edition that Henry Dana Ward wrote it? Because it was found out that it was a contributed article and there was

no connection between the article and Henry Dana Ward. But if I am to stick by this, it was him regardless.

On the same page in the old edition, I read:

"In the year 1840, another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest. Two years before, Josiah Litch, one of the leading ministers preaching the second advent, published an exposition of Revelation 9, predicting the fall of the Ottoman empire, and specifying not only the year but the very day on which this would take place."

In the revised edition it reads: "In the year 1840, another remarkable fulfillment of prophecy excited widespread interest. Two years before, Josiah Litch, one of the leading ministers preaching the second advent, published an exposition of Revelation 9, predicting the fall of the Ottoman empire. According to his calculations, this power was to be overthrown 'in A.D. 1840, sometime in the month of August;'. So instead of saying the particular day, the revised edition says "sometime in the month of August". Why did it not say the very day in the revised edition? Because we had in the General Conference vaults the pamphlet, and it did not specify the day. Therefore it was perfectly proper to correct it, and I am glad it was corrected because it puts it now in harmony with the fact.

I wanted to call attention to this for it was done by the author while she was living, and shows that the author and editors recognized the propriety of making changes necessary when newly discovered facts were brought forward.

QUESTION: Didn't Elder Litch say that event would occur on August 11, 1840?

PRESCOTT: Yes. Read on in the revised edition and it will say that: "According to his calculations, this power was to be overthrown 'in A.D. 1840, sometime in the month of August; and only a few days previous to its accomplishment he wrote: 'Allowing the first period, 150 years, to have been exactly fulfilled before Deacozes ascended the throne by permission of the Turks, and that the 391 years, fifteen days, commenced at the close of the first period, it will end on the 11th of August, 1840, when the Ottoman power in Constantinople may be expected to be broken. And this, I believe, will be found to be the case.' " Josiah Litch, then, set the date at August 11, 1840, but instead of doing it two years before the event, it was ten days before the event. That being discovered, it is corrected to agree with the fact, but that doesn't destroy the Spirit of Prophecy.

QUESTION: The actual thing he said is there however, isn't it?

PRESCOTT: Yes, but I refer to the statement in the first place that it was made two years before the event. When evidence of fact was presented, the book was changed to conform to those facts, and it is proper that it should be.

Now turn to page 382, old edition: "The message of Revelation 14 announcing the fall of Babylon, must apply to religious bodies that were once pure and have become corrupt. Since this message follows the warning of the Judgment, it must be given in the last days, therefore it cannot refer to

the Romish Church, for that church has been in a fallen condition for many centuries."

Revised edition: "The message of Revelation 14, announcing the fall of Babylon, must apply to religious bodies that were once pure and have become corrupt. Since this message follows the warning of the judgment, it must be given in the last days; therefore it cannot refer to the Roman Church alone, for that church has been in a fallen condition for many centuries."

The word "alone" is added in the revised edition. The difference made is that in the old edition it says it cannot refer to the Roman Church, while in the new edition it says it cannot refer to the Roman Church alone. It would really infer that the Roman Church is head of the whole thing, but not all of it.

Page 589, last full paragraph. "Protestants little know what they are doing when they propose to accept the aid of Rome in the work of Sunday exaltation. While they are bent upon the accomplishment of their purpose, Rome is aiming to re-establish her power, to recover her lost supremacy. Let history testify of her artful and persistent efforts to insinuate herself into the affairs of nations; and having gained a foothold, to further her own aims, even at the ruin of princes and people. Rome openly puts forth the claim that the pope can pronounce sentences and judgments in contradiction to the right of nations, to the law of God and man." The reference at the bottom of the page is the "Decretalia."

Revised edition, same page. "History testifies of her artful and persistent efforts to insinuate herself into

the affairs of nations; and having gained a foothold, to further her own aims, even at the ruin of princes and people. In the year 1204, Pope Innocent III. extracted from Peter II., King of Arragon, the following extraordinary oath: "I, Peter, king of Arragonians, profess and promise to be ever faithful and obedient to my lord, Pope Innocent, to his Catholic successors, and the Roman Church, and faithfully to preserve my kingdom in his obedience, defending the Catholic faith, and persecuting heretical pravity." This is in harmony with the claims regarding the power of the Roman pontiff, that 'it is lawful for him to depose emperors,' and that 'he can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous rulers.'"

Why was that entirely different paragraph put in in the revised edition? Because it was found that upon investigation that this statement concerning the Papacy was misapplied in the old edition and could not be used as it was there at all. Therefore it was wholly discarded and a different paragraph substituted; very appropriately, too.

a

7/10

W WPRESCOTT

Page 50, bottom of the page, in the middle of the paragraph.

[Reading] "More than this, the pope has arrogated the very titles of Deity. He styles himself "Lord God the Pope," assumes infallibility, and demands that all men pay him homage. Thus the same claim urged by Satan in the wilderness of temptation is still urged by him through the Church of Rome, and vast numbers are ready to yield him homage." [Old Edition]

"More than this, the pope has been given the very titles of Deity. He has been styled "Lord God the Pope," and has been declared infallible. He demands the homage of all men," etc.

[New Edition]

You can see the difference between others' doing it with reference to the pope, and his doing it himself. That is what makes the change. It was not true that the pope has styled himself Lord God the pope, in fact I don't think that quotation itself should be used at all. The quotation "Lord God the Pope" is not in the old edition of the canon law. The laws are simply the expression of opinions regarding the matters of the law. That expression was discarded after 1532. Roman Catholics deny the whole thing, and they claim to bring forth evidence that the original manuscript has been discovered in the Vatican library, and that the word God is not in it. They say that the word is not there, and say "Our Lord the Pope. He never styled himself such, and the pope never assumed infallibility. It was conferred upon him by the action of the council.

Page 261, the last full paragraph: [Reading] "This monstrous doctrine is essentially the same as the Romish claim that "the pope

can dispense above the law, and of wrong make right, by correcting and changing laws;" that "he can pronounce sentences and judgments in contradiction . . . to the law of God and man." Both reveal the inspiration of the same master-spirit, -- of him who, even among the sinless inhabitants of Heaven, began his work of seeking to break down the righteous restraints of the law of God." [Old Edition]

"These monstrous doctrines are essentially the same as the later teaching of popular educators and theologians, -- that there is no unchangeable divine law as the standard of right, but that the standard of morality is indicated by society itself, and has constantly been subject to change. All these ideas are inspired by the same master-spirit, -- by him who, even among the sinless inhabitants of heaven, began his work of seeking to break down the righteous restraints of the law of God." [New Edition]

Why were those quotations left out in the revised edition and a new wording given? Because it was discovered that this was a wrong use, and part of it is not Roman Catholic teaching at all. That quotation that we have used so much that the pope can of wrong make right by correcting and changing laws, that isn't an exact translation of it, but it comes from an article on the question of transferring a bishop from one see to another see. There was a long struggle between the pope and the bishops, whether the pope had the right of himself to change bishops from one place to another. The pope claimed the right to transfer them, and the bishops opposed it. One of their arguments was that the law does not confer the right to change a bishop from one place to another. The answer was, O that doesn't touch the case at all. The pope can

make what is wrong right by simply changing the law. But it was with reference to the law of changing bishops, and not the law of the ten commandments. Then very properly that whole paragraph was changed in the revised version with those facts were brought to light. The quotation to which Brother Comer refers, I can dispense even with the *precepts* of Christ, referred to Pope Nicholas. I hunted off and on from five to ten years, and finally found it in the British Museum library in Fox's Acts and Monuments. And Fox in writing sort of personified himself, and said "I can do thus and so". He referred to some statement of Pope Nicholas that he thought had that idea, but Pope Nicholas never used those words at all. But we have used that quotation for a long time as being a statement from Pope Nicholas.

The point is this, that when it was found that these statements needed to be revised because of any evidence of fact, they were revised with the cooperation and consent of the author.

F M WILCOX: I didn't know that Brother Prescott was going to take up this question today, but when the question had been raised regarding the changes in Great Controversy, I thought I would bring over and read part of a letter that Sister White wrote me personally under date of July 25, 1911. This is signed in writing by her own hand, and is her own original signature.

[WILCOX TO FURNISH COPY]

67d

F M WILCOX: Now in connection with that statement I want to read here just a brief statement from this old book of Sister White's, Spiritual Gifts, Volume 2. The position that Sister White has taken withreference to the revision of Great Controversy is the very position she took in the preparation of her early works. This book was printed in 1860. She says in the preface signed by her initials:

[WILCOX TO FURNISH COPY]

Near the close of the book she says:

[WILCOX TO FURNISH COPY]

She prints in the remaining pages a number of testimonials from different brethren and sisters who saw her in vision, and who were witnesses of incidents she relates, and some of these, in their testimonials say that that incident was correct with this exception. Another says this was correct with this exception. That is just a little different than you presented it.

I speak of that and read that to show that Sister White back there used the same care and the same means in making her work regarding the historical data correct, that she has used in Great Controversy. Those things, instead of causing me to lose my confidence in the work of Sister White, they confirm it, because I believe she was an honest woman and adhered to the truth in the fear of God. My faith in the testimonies doesn't turn on a phrase. I don't judge the testimonies of Sister White in her visions by some things that I hear my brethren mention.

F. M. WILCOX: Some things are brought forward concerning the Testimonies of Sister White that are perplexing(?), But I look at the spirit in Sister White's work. I look at the fruit of her labor. I look at the manner in which she saved this cause from destruction and disaster. I think in her life work, the general spirit attending her life is evidence of her divine call from God as the messenger of this denomination. (Amens).

PRESCOTT: Whether one believes in the Spirit of Prophecy or not, can be decided from a very practical test. My experience has been such as to give me more faith in the Spirit of Prophecy. I will mention our experience in coming to Washington in this connection. I was right in that myself. We were finally directed by Sister White to come to Washington from Battle Creek. When we left Battle Creek there were those that said we had better save our packing cases to bring our things back; and they said there was not any one coming down to Washington that had business experience enough to run the thing at all, and that we were cutting ourselves off from our business connections of half a century. I tell you to go through that was a test of whether you actually believed the Guidance or not. Well we took that guidance and came here, and you know the rest. I have seen many things of that kind. I have been with Sister White myself and we had some association about things I cannot well refer to here. I have seen for myself what the guidance meant to us, and in practical affairs, and I do not have any question of the Spirit of Prophecy. I believe in it. But I must ^{face} ~~confess~~ this, that it is here of her own work, and draw my own conclusions. Please do not understand I mean we are to try to upset everything stated in the Spirit of Prophecy or the books. I do say that when you come to a simple statement of facts

of history, she herself by her own course appeals to the facts, 561
and we can do the same.

TAIT: In other words, she never claimed she had inspired
evidence in regard to these dates and historical facts. Others
made that plain for her but she never claimed it herself.

PRESCOTT: I talked to Eld. W. C. White about this matter,
as I had something to do with this book, and he has told me that there
was no claim that this book was to be an inspired authority on ~~the~~
facts of history.

G. B. THOMPSON: I have a long statement here that was sent out
by W. C. White giving an explanation of these corrections, in
which ~~Sister White says:~~ he says:

"When we presented to Mother the request of some of our
canvassers that there should be given in the new edition, not
only scripture references, but also references to the historians
quoted, she instructed us to hunt up and insert the historical
references. She also instructed us to verify the quotations,
and to correct any inaccuracies found; and where quotations were
made from passages that were rendered differently by different
translators, to use that translation which was found to be most
correct and authentic.

"In a few instances, new quotations from historians,
preachers, and present-day writers, have been used in the place
of the old, because they are more forceful, or because we have
been unable to find the old ones. In each case where there has
been such a change, Mother has given faithful attention to the
proposed substitution, and has approved of the change.

"When we came to go over this matter for the purpose of
giving historical references, there were some quotations which we
could not find. In some cases there were found other statements
making the same point, from other historians. These were in books
accessible ~~to~~ in many public libraries. When we brought to Mother's
attention a quotation that we could not find, and showed her that
there was another quotation that we had found, which made the same
point, she said, "Use the one you can give reference to, so that
the reader of the book, if he wishes to go to the source and find
it, can do so." In that way some historical data have been substi-
tuted."

PRESCOTT: I want to emphasize this. It cannot be considered an attack on these books when I simply compare them and point out the differences she herself approved of.

ROBINSON: I suppose I was with Sister White at the time of the revision of Great Controversy, and in my thirteen years' experience as her secretary I am naturally interested in some of the questions raised. I know that Sister White appreciated the work of Brother Prescott and others in calling attention to some of these slight inaccuracies in the historical work; and when the plates were worn out and a new edition became necessary, she did instruct us as her workers to do everything we could to make everything accurate. I think that Brother Crisler and myself spent nearly six months in the study of Great Controversy. There were many points raised. I will say this, that not all the suggestions that were sent in by our brethren were followed. And as a personal testimony I want to say that in all my experience with Sister White I had nothing that more distinctly confirmed my faith in the divine guidance than the work with we did in the revision of Great Controversy. As Bible and History teachers, you know how hard it is to write history and how even the best historians err. In the revision of Great Controversy we went to the library and compared these points that were raised, one by one; there were really over a hundred questions that had been raised. We went carefully into these in the libraries at Stanford and Berkeley. In some instances where strong ~~skatxxxxx~~ quotations were made regarding the claims of the Papacy she took this position for making the

change: not because it was not true the statements she had made, but because of the fact that the Papacy had succeeded in destroying the evidence, and it was very difficult to find the things that would back it up; and in some cases she suggested alterations because of that. In one instance—I do not remember the details—the evidence was found several months afterwards, but the change had been made already. It is a fact that in history as well as in science modern ideas are being moulded largely by the Papacy and apologies are made and history is being covered up today, and I feel that we should be cautioned against taking statements by some of the modern histories as against the Great Controversy. I think that some of the suggestions were sent in because of this principle. Modern history is very popular, but when we go to the libraries and look up other histories we find contradictions. I think that to each of our publishing houses there was sent a large document in which the authentic histories are quoted. You will notice in the Appendix of Great Controversy references are given. These references were copied out and sent to our publishing houses.

TAIT: There is an Idea that I believe Satan himself is trying to press in upon this people, that the founders of this message never had ~~xxx~~ in their heads at all in regard to the standing of Sister White's work. I understand that some of our younger men have taught—or have been taught—that Sister White's writings are on a par with Isaiah, Jeremiah and all the rest of the Bible writers. I heard Elder Butler and other elders stand up in our camp meetings and teach so earnestly that

Sister White's writings were measured by the Bible, and the Bible was brought to show whether these writings were correct. And Elder White himself never spoke of the infallibility of Sister White's writings. But I do believe they are inspired; and if you allow Sister White herself to carry things along, and not a few men with extreme and fanatical ideas, we won't get into any trouble. But I have observed that the men who carried these extreme views have many of them left the faith. Sister White's teaching is always directing us to the infallibility of the Bible, and never to herself or her writings as a standard. She is so much different from these others who have come forward.

W.G.WIRTH: I believe thoroughly in the spirit of prophecy, but I have believed it in the way it was brought out this afternoon. I have never believed that the history of the spirit of prophecy was to be taken as inspired. I have believed that the philosophy of the books was to be accepted, but have thought that the history was merely thrown in to substantiate the principles.

It is all very well to say that here, as brethren together, but I want to know what to do with my brethren out in the field and with the young men that want to know about some of these things. Because I did not teach that the history of "Great Controversy" was absolutely inspired, I got into trouble with some of the brethren out there. I think that is a real question for us to get information on as teachers. I would like to ask what Professor Prescott would do in a Bible class.

~~W.W.PRESCOTT:~~

W.E.HOWELL: This whole question will be brought before the conference again, probably the coming week.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Will you let me state my position with reference to the matter of dates that Brother Premier has brought up? In view of what we have said here, my personal position is simply this, that the whole question of history in fulfillment of prophecy is a field for study. My study of this question has led me to the position that 533 is the primary date for the beginning of the 1260 years, and that 538 is the secondary date. I do not consider myself as disbelieving the spirit of prophecy because I take that position, and I do not condemn anybody as a heretic who does not believe that.

F. M. Wilcox: I take 538 and 1798.

W. W. PRESCOTT: I do not have the least trouble with Brother Wilcox on that question. All I ask is, Do not brand me as a heretic and

as ~~an~~ one who sets at naught the spirit of prophecy. My study of history led me to the conclusion that 533 is the primary date.

R. A. UNDERWOOD: I believe there are two extremes. Some of our good brethren present the Testimonies just the same as the Bible. I never have believed that. I think the Bible is the thing to measure everything else by; and when we add to the Bible we are liable to get the plagues added to us. We cannot do that. ~~I think~~

At one time Sister S. M. I. Henry was in great trouble over this question, and she prayed most earnestly for light. ~~Others~~ Others of us prayed, and this was the light that came to her: She could not harmonize the idea that what Sister White had written was on the same basis as the Bible,--I cannot, either,--and it was represented to her that the writings of Sister White were like a great telescope through which we were to look at the word of God. It magnified the word of God, it broadened it out. When she saw that idea, it was a great source of comfort and help to us all.

D. H. KRESS: Isn't that true of all the prophets? They magnify the law.

5 UNDERWOOD: But the canon of the Scriptures was closed, and Sister White says so. She does not put ~~her~~ her words on the same basis. Take the tithing question that Sister White has endorsed absolutely over and over again as the method by which Gods servants should be supported. You go back in history when I embraced the truth, and we not have any tithing system. We had then what was called systematic benevolence. But Elder Butler and Elder Morrison and a few of us studied the question of tithing, and Elder Butler first wrote a book on tithing; but I could give you the names of men who are now sleeping, and one who is living, who said, No sir, Sister White has endorsed systematic benevolence, and

she used the strongest language that I have ever heard anywhere. And if you read my little article in the Review and Herald recently on finance, you have it there. She said it came right down from heaven; but that was very different from tithing. A man paid 2% on his holdings, whether his income from his property was 10% or 50% or ~~more~~ 100%, he paid 2% on the value of his property.

I wrote a series of thirteen lessons on the tithing question for the Sabbath schools to study, making the basis of the whole thing Christ's ownership. Our brethren came around and said Sister White never indorsed this; but later on she endorsed it absolutely, as you know. I think that is a fair illustration. The spirit of prophecy comes forward to bring unity into the church. But the basis, I believe, should be the Bible. I believe Elder Prescott is right here. That doesn't destroy faith in the Spirit of prophecy, either. I think it is very improper for us to get up in public and say, reading from the spirit of prophecy, "God says so and so." I think it has all that effect when reading to believers, but the Bible is for ever body.

(Adjourned to 9 A. M. Friday, the 11th)