

Tuesday, July 8, 9:00 A. M.

W. W. PRESCOTT (Continuing study of The Person of Christ): Why was it that the children of Israel so soon after their promise to do all that the Lord had said, utterly failed, and went into open apostasy?--Because they did not have a vision of Christ before their eyes, because their vision ^{was the vision} of self rather than a vision of Christ.

In the morning hour yesterday, Brother Daniells spoke to us of John the Baptist and his experience, from the standpoint of his being filled with the Spirit, -his father filled with the Spirit, his mother filled with the Spirit, and he filled with the Spirit.

Let us take a view of that same experience just from another standpoint. I read from "Gospel Workers," page 54:

"John the Baptist in his desert life was taught of God. He studied the revelations of God in nature. Under the guiding of the divine Spirit, he studied the scrolls of the prophets. By day and by night, Christ was his study, his meditation, until mind and heart and soul were filled with the glorious vision."

That brought into his experience a personal presence. He had the same kind of vision that Paul had when he was on the way to Damascus, and in describing which he said to Agrippa, "Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." This was a vision of Christ, a daily experience of the vision of Christ. Brother Daniells this morning was asking us about our experience in this thing. I speak out of my own experience when I say that that which has helped me the most has been to make this thing so real to me that the vision of Christ is the vision of a real person to me, and that He, not merely an influence from Him, shall be a present reality to me, just as I can see Brother Tait

here and know he is here, because I see him and hear him speak. That to me, has been the most help and the best experience, and what I have felt hindered me was that for a long time I gave more thought to the things about Christ and to standing for the defence of teachings about Christ than that I had that personal experience with Him rather than with ideas about Him. That is my personal experience, Brother Daniells, and that has helped me more than anything else. I have had this intense longing, this earnest desire; but I think it is more than a sentiment or longing or desire. It involves an absolute cutting loose from everything else in order to be able to receive what we are asking for and longing for,--an absolute submission. It has affected me in a very personal way, in some experiences that I do not need to go into. The more this vision of Christ the person is before me, the more I rejoice in Him, and the more it brings to me that help that I have longed for for many years.

May I read just a word further: "By day and by night [repeating the last sentence read before], Christ was his study, his meditation, until mind and heart and soul were filled with the glorious vision.

"He looked upon the King in His beauty, and self was lost sight of. He beheld the majesty of holiness, and knew himself to be inefficient and unworthy. It was God's message that he was to declare. It was in God's power and His righteousness that he was to stand. He was ready to go forth as Heaven's messenger, unawed by the humna, because he had looked upon the Divine. He could stand fearless in the presence of earthly monarchs, because with trembling he had bowed before the King of kings.

"With no elaborate arguments or fine-spun theories did John declare his message. Startling and stern, yet full of hope, his

voice was heard from the wilderness, "Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

It was not because he was an orator, and could use beautiful illustrations and fine language, but because when he spoke, he spoke as one having authority, and the people recognized his authority when he spoke. He did not establish it by argument, but by what he was.

A. G. DANIELLS: And he was a representative of the people for this day.

W. W. PRESCOTT: (Reading) from page 55) "Our message must be as direct as was the message of John. He rebuked kings for their iniquity. Notwithstanding that his life was imperiled, he did not hesitate to declare God's word. And our work in this age must be done as faithfully.

"In order to give such a message as John gave, we must have a spiritual experience like his."

What I have been trying to emphasize is, Christ was what he taught. He taught the truth, and he was the truth. That, to me, is the difference between actually preaching the truth and talking about the truth. One can talk about the truth, and use all the words of scripture, and build up a beautiful and interesting theory of it. He could be eloquent, oratorical, and interest the people, and they would want to come again and hear him, and yet he not be preaching the truth.

T. E. BOWEN: And the Jews lost the way because He did not come just as they thought from the Scriptures.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Yes, and it is very easy for us to see how the

Jews missed the way--because they held to their own interpretation of the Scriptures--and then we do exactly the same thing. When I read the 7th chapter of Mark, I take it to myself just as much as for the Jews. And I think one of our dangers has been that we were so sure that we had the truth that we did not want any more. If any one came with any more truth, we were afraid he was departing from the faith. I believe in the real, genuine message of this gospel just as it was started, but I do not believe that the men who started it were infallible, any more than you and I are; and if I read the spirit of prophecy aright, we are to go on all the time, studying the truth. If there are no differences arising among us, if there are no discussions of these things, it is because we are not advancing. I do not think that means departing from the faith.

A. G. DANIELLS: And it does not mean a stampede away. We will go as far as we have light and evidence.

W. W. PRESCOTT: I sometimes think one reason why we do not receive a fuller measure of the Spirit is because we are afraid of the Spirit, afraid that it might lead us away from the things we have taught already, and make us change our view. I distinguish between the things that are fundamental, the very foundation of this message, and the things that are nonessential, that are not absolutely necessary for salvation, and concerning which we can have a difference of view, and both be giving the message.

M.C.WILCOX: I can remember when I was afraid to pray for the Spirit because I thought it would ask me to do something I did not want to do.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I have been trying to emphasize the person of

Christ, and especially the person of Christ in relation to the question of doctrine and teaching. I am a little embarrassed because we can just go on exploring that field all the time we are here, and yet there are some other phases that I want to bring out. I thought I would stop that phase of it with just this suggestion. You carry the same principle of the study of the Scriptures into every part of it, and you will find the same thing will apply,--that He is the doctrine. I put it this way: ~~22~~ Romans 5:1: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." But in Ephesians 2:14, it says "He is our peace." I think those go together, and that being justified by faith, we have peace. That is just the same thing exactly from another angle, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.

Then we take that through the Scriptures and find what He may be to us as our peace, and what that peace means different from mere sentiment, mere feeling of satisfaction, of peace with God. And He is our peace with God by what He is,--God with us,--and not because we have a certain feeling of satisfaction, and are not disturbed over things. That kind of peace one can have when he is in the midst of things that would otherwise greatly trouble him.

When Christ was going to leave the disciples, he said to them: "Let not your heart be troubled." Outward things may come, but "let not your heart be troubled." He is our peace.

I take that same thought still farther. "If any man lack wisdom let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not." When we ask for wisdom, we ask for a revelation of Christ. He is wisdom, as stated in I Cor. 1:30: "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." It is He, not it.

C.P.BOLLMAN: Why do you emphasize the it in that connection?

W.W.PRESCOTT: So as to emphasize the impersonal, so that wisdom shall be merely it.

A.G.DANIELLS: Something apart from Christ.

W.W.PRESCOTT: Yes, Christ is the wisdom. Then it is not simply wisdom, but all the other things together with it. We must view it from this standpoint,--what Christ can be to us in this way and in that way. Then we will find Christ is all. (Several amen's)

(PRESCOTT--Cont'd)

325

Now let us turn to another side of this question. Let us read a few scriptures to show how this view of truth affected the preaching of the apostles. I desire for my own part that this shall have its influence upon our teaching and preaching, not merely just to study here together. Now how did this view of Christ affect the teaching and preaching of the apostles?

Readingx These are some of the Scriptures taken from the record of their experience when they were sent out to continue the work that Christ in his own Person in the flesh had commenced. The book begins: "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach." Now he is making a record of what he continued to teach, first in his own individual body here and second in the body of his disciples.

Reading, Acts 2:36 "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Now that appears to be the summary of what has gone before. He sums it up in these words. He centers it on the Person of Jesus.

Acts 5:42: "(Revised version) "And every day in the temple and at home, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ." They ceased not to teach Jesus as the Messiah. All was centered in him the Person.

Acts 8:5 (R.V.) "And Philip went down to the city of Samaria and proclaimed unto them the Christ." He proclaimed unto them Christ, the Messiah. That was the issue--Christ--this Person.

Verse 35: "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto ~~them~~^{him} Jesus." There is a great meaning in that Scripture to me. Here was a man that was so much off a heathen that he did not know whether Isaiah was speaking in the 53rd chapter of himself or some other man. Here is a man riding along and reading the prophets, and he happens to be (I say "happens to be") reading Isaiah, and he comes to the 53rd chapter, and wonders what it means, whether it has reference to Isaiah or some other man. He sees a man and asks him to come up, inquiring of him, "Whom is the prophet speaking of, himself or some other person?" Did Philip say, "I have here an outline of a sermon in my pocket, and will explain it to you."? No, it says, he "began at that same scripture, and preached Jesus". That has a great lesson in it for us. Suppose I were to fall in with a man and he says, "What does this mean," and I try to find some outline of a sermon I preached last year on this subject, to explain it to him? No, that would not do. It says, beginning with that same scripture he preached unto him Jesus. Now that requires a life of study and prayer and living with the Book, and with the Person. One might think that particular scripture was talking about Christ. We think certain passages of Scripture talk about Christ and that we can preach from these, such as Genesis 3:15, Deut. 18:15. But the whole Bible is a manifestation of Christ. We preach from the 53rd chapter of Isaiah because we feel everybody can see it refers to Jesus, and let the rest go. There is too much of that in our preaching.

SORENSEN: There is a large number of people who say that chapter does not speak of Christ, and do not see

Christ in it. We need the same skill to meet them on that chapter as on any other chapter.

PRESCOTT: I read last evening: "The living Christ is a composite photograph of the experience ~~ix~~ of the best that is in Christians." Now how shall we disprove that? (the statements of those who do not see Christ in that chapter) Not by argument. It has got to be by authority that goes with the one in whom the living Christ actually dwells (amens). There is no other way.

The Holy Spirit was not promised to the world. Christ said: "If I depart I will send him unto you, and he when he is come will convict the world (through whom?). Now just as the humanity of Christ furnished the channel through which the revelation of God could be made to the world, so the believers furnish the channel through which Christ and God can be made to the world. God's promise is that when the Spirit comes to the believer he will convict the world. The Holy Spirit is not promised to the world in that way.

PALMER: If we voluntarily are by our teaching dropping Christ out; may not that be a step towards that world movement to drop Christ out entirely?

PRESCOTT: I think the only safety for us now, when we think of the teaching that in the world--the great names back of that teaching--I do not think we make real enough to us the experience of Christ. In the first place he came from a town of bad reputation! second, he had never been through their schools. He had not been a disciple of Hillel. He was simply a carpenter that grew up in a town of bad reputation, and

then he appeared to teach against the teachings of those leaders of the day (Amen). But he convicted the people (amen). But we must remember that he was a man just as dependent upon the power of the convicting Spirit as we are (amens). Now we do not make him human enough in that respect. It does not detract in any way from his Deity as the Son of God to view him in this light. He was just as ~~much~~ truly man as he was God, and just as truly God as he was Man. We never can explain that.

(PRESCOTT)

DANIELLS: He veiled his divinity in humanity, ^Abut he was Deity just the same .

PRESCOTT: By voluntarily putting himself under our human limitations, he was just as dependent upon the Holy Spirit as a man, as we are.

DANIELLS: Coming forth from that town of bad reputation, and not from schools of divinity he convicted the world. Now we have seen in heathen lands our own boys of 12 and 14 grades training, winning more heathen to Jesus than men with "D. D.s" These men discounted our boys because they were not titled men.

PRESCOTT: I have found in the heathen fields some young men of 12 and 14 grades' that were winning souls right along while some of our own men with degrees were not doing it. That is nothing against the degrees, but something in favor of the Spirit of the living Christ.

It is this matter of personal experience with him that I emphasize because I know what it means. I know if I am out of the current of that thought and that experience and fellowship with Christ , I cannot go before an audience and preach with the convicting power of Christ.

W W PRESCOTT: I want to live with Him. (Chorus of Amens)
I don't say that those things should not be done, but I say I can't put them together. So that when I am to do that kind of work I must have time with God every day. And every time one appears before a company, no matter how much they have done it, my experience is that just as soon as a man thinks he knows how to do it, he has lost the ability to do it, and that he must have that sense every hour and every time, or he loses it.

Acts 11:20: "And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus."

You see how that their view of Christ is personal, and his promise, "Lo, I am with you always, I am with you," there in the fourteenth of John he had told them how that would be fulfilled. Then they preached him.

Acts 17:18: "Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection."

That was it, when they preached the person. Don't think that they didn't bring out the doctrine, they preached Jesus and the resurrection. We will see as we study from this standpoint that every doctrine that would make them sound Christians was preached to them in preaching Jesus, because Jesus was the doctrine.

L Cor. 1:23, 24: "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

Suppose we put with that Romans 1:16, 17: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith." Put those two together, and to preach the gospel as the power of God is to preach Christ the person. Not a system of teachings, simply, but Him, we preach, and there is that other verse, "We preach Christ crucified." "Preaching of the cross," it says in that same chapter. The word of the cross, the message of the cross. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross." Not simply two pieces of wood one across the other, but the cross in the sense of the person on the cross, the crucified cross.

We are now ready to see what effect the ^{person} preaching of Christ had upon the preaching of these men.

1 Cor. 2:2: "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified."

Do you think that church kept the Sabbath? Yes. Do you think they paid tithe? Yes. Do you think there was any essential doctrine of the gospel that they didn't know and practice?

CHAS THOMPSON: I presume it was quite a model church

W W PRESCOTT: Yes. But what was the theme when Paul raised up the people? Christ and Him crucified. There is a statement in Gospel Warfare like this: "Ministers are to present Christ in his fulness in the churches and in new fields." (p.163)

We should go out among heathen people just as Paul did. Christ in his fulness is to be preached, and that will bring I think the same result. When the Apostle Paul sought to meet philosophy with philosophy, and to attach his gospel to what they already knew about religion, he didn't raise up a church. But when he went on from that, among the same heathen people, he determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified, and then he raised up a church.

Gal. 1:15, 16: "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood."

Notice that the experience preceded the preaching. "When it pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him." The experience of the revelation of the Person in himself, preceded the preaching Him. No person can preach him unless the Son is revealed in that person. So it is a matter of personal experience this question of preaching Christ. No education, no logical ability, no eloquence, can take the place of the actual personal experience, yet that needn't discount the ability and education and oratory, if they are rightly directed. But it can't take the place of that experience.

Eph. 3:8: "Unto me, who ~~am~~ am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ."

The same idea is emphasized, you see. They He had the experience of those men, as Peter and Philip in the Book of Acts. Here is the experience of Paul. "Have not I seen the Lord?" "I was not disco-

bedient unto the heavenly vision." "It pleased God to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach Him"

Phil. 1:15-18: "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: But the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel. What then: notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

There is something a little striking here about that scripture. There is a bit of difference there. There was a faction that opposed the teaching of Paul, but he said, Whether it is in pretence or sincerity, some way Christ is preached, and so he would rejoice.

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

See, "Christ in you, the hope of glory, whom we preach."
With all this comes the warning.

Col. 2:8-10: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power."

You see with all that other positive, here is the direct warning.
"Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit,

after the rudiments of the world, and not according to Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Here we have brought out both sides of the matter of experience as the result of the manifestations of Christ. It indicates to me very clearly that these men went out and preached a person, presented everything in that person, and yet they didn't neglect anything that was essential to salvation.

I hope that this study of their experience will have an effect on our experience. They preached that way. I don't think we can improve upon their way of preaching, and I think our preaching should be to proclaim Christ. Preach Him, PREACH HIM, not simply about Him.

A G DANIELLS: As you were speaking Brother Quinn called my attention to a statement in Christ's Object Lessons, and said he would like to see this incorporated in your talk this morning. It is so splendidly brought out here by you:

"As the apostles set forth the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father, three thousand souls were convicted. They were made to see themselves as they were, sinful and polluted, and Christ as their friend and Redeemer. Christ was lifted up, Christ was glorified, through the power of the Holy Spirit resting upon men. . . The people church beheld converts flocking to her from all directions. Believers were re-converted. . . Every Christian saw in his brother the divine similitude of benevolence and love...One object swallowed up all others. All hearts beat in harmony. The only ambition of the believers was to reveal the likeness of Christ's character, and to labor for the enlargement of His kingdom. . . .These scenes are to be repeated, and with greater power. The

outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the former rain, but the latter rain will be more abundant. The Spirit awaits our demand and reception. Christ is again to be revealed in His fulness by the Holy Spirit's power. Men will discern the value of the precious pearl, and with the apostle Paul they will say, "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord."

W E HOWELL: Here are two sentences that we read at our teachers' conference last night that fit well with that. In the book "Education", as one of the principles of instruction to our teachers, "In the teacher sent from God, heaven gave to men its best and greatest. He was who had stood in the counsels of the Most High, who had dwelt in the innermost sanctuary of the Eternal, was the one chosen to reveal in person to humanity the knowledge of God."

TEN MINUTES INTERMISSION

Not only has God shown the great mountain peaks of prophecy, but in Daniel 11, especially the first part, he has descended to the minutest detail of the privacies of personal life, and these are thus shown to be under his supervision just as truly as the rise and fall of empires. The modern critics are saying that the book must have been written after the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, because the statements are as accurate as a History written in his time. But we believe it was written 200 years before the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that God could look down and see that man's whole career. Let me read the 25th verse:

"And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him."

He is this Antiochus Epiphanes, and the two armies are the armies of these two men.

H.C.LACEY (reading his paraphrase): Daniel 11:25: "And he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall stir up (B.C.171) his power and his courage against the king of the south (Ptolemy Philometer) with a great army ("a great multitude"); and the king of the south (Ptolemy Philometer) ~~shall be~~ shall be stirred up with a very great and mighty army ("very many and exceeding strong horses" Newton) ~~but he~~ but he (Ptolemy Philometer) shall not stand ("was afraid and fled"): for they shall forecast devices against him (Eulacus, his minister, Macron, a premier, the Alexandrians).

Verse 26: "Yea, they that feed of the portion of his (Ptolemy's) meat (his ministers, Eulacus, Macron, ~~etc.~~ etc.) shall destroy (by

corrupting and betraying) him (Ptolemy Philometer), and his
(Ptolemy's) army shall overflow and many shall fall down slain."

A.G.DANIELLS: What does it mean by overflowing?

H.C.LACEY: They dispersed and were defeated. In the old view
Rome shall overflow, and many shall fall down slain.

A.G.DANIELLS: Does overflow mean to disperse and to run out?

H.C.LACEY: Exactly the same criticism may be applied to both
views. I suppose we could turn the thing around and make it apply
to Rome.

Here is the language in I Maccabees 1:16, 17, 18, 19. (Reads)

You see that the language both in the Bible and the apocryphal
book is practically identical.

Verse 27: "And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.*"

Upon his arrival at Memphis, Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philopator frequently ate and conversed together "at one table," Antiochus pretending he would favor the cause of Ptolemy as against the usurpation of his brother Pnysson. This Antiochus pretends to espouse the cause of this older nephew against his brother, Ptolemy laying the blame of the whole campaign upon Eulasus, his majesty who betrayed him, and professing great obligations to his uncle Antiochus. But these protestations of friendship were "lies" on his part. As soon as Antiochus had withdrawn, the two brothers, Ptolemy and Pnysson, made peace through the mediation of their sister Cleopatra, and agreed to reign conjointly in Egypt. But even this did not prosper. The two monarchs came to blows at the time appointed.

Now let us read into the Scripture the names of these kings: "And both these kings' hearts (Antiochus Epiphanes and Ptolemy Philopator) shall be to do mischief (each hoping to circumvent the other), and they shall speak lies at one table (in apparent friendliness), but it (this patched up peace between them) shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed."

Verse 28: "Then shall he return into his own land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land." That is the prophecy.

Antiochus hoping that the two Egyptian brothers would ruin each other in civil war, returned to Syria. He took with him immense treasures from the captured towns of Egypt. The verse says "he shall return . . . with great riches." History says he took immense spoils from the captured towns of Egypt. In 1 Maccabees 1: 19 and 20 it is stated, "Thus they got the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils thereof." That is the history.

Notice it says "his heart shall be against the holy covenant." The next verse --(1 Maccabees 1:20) "And after that Antiochus had smitten Egypt, he returned again in the hundred (312 of the ---- era, which is B.C.169) forty and third year, and went up against Israel and Jerusalem with a great multitude, and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light, and all the vessels thereof, and the table of the shewbread, and the pouring vessels, and the vials, and the censers of gold, and the veil, and the crowns, and the golden ornaments that were before the temple, all which he pulled off. He took also the silver and the gold, and the precious vessels: also he took the hidden treasures which he found. And when he had taken all away, he went into his own land, having made a great massacre, and spoken very proudly."

That is the history. The prophecy reads thus: "and his heart shall be against the holy covenant." There is more to that than this, too, -- "his heart shall be against it." When he was in Egypt a false report had been circulated of his death. Thereupon Jason, the ex-high priest -- (Antiochus Epiphanes had done this) Thereupon Jason, the ex-high priest, returned to Jerusalem, drove his brother Menelaus out of office, and cruelly ill-treated the citizens. Antiochus, thinking the whole nation had revolted, and hearing that they had made great rejoicing at the report of his death, besieged Jerusalem with a great army, took the city by storm, and vented his anger upon the helpless Jews. He slew 40,000 of them, and sold 40,000 more, polluted the temple, offered swine's flesh on the altar of God, restored Menelaus to the priesthood, and made Philip, a barbarian, governor of Judaea. "He shall do exploits," and then "return to his own land," just as these events here are brought forth.

PROF. ANDERSON: What verse in the chapter do you allude to when you speak of the pollution of the temple, as you read in the history?

PROF. LACEY: In the 11th chapter, when we get down to verse 30, there is the point. All these modern scholars, I believe -- I don't like to say "all," but the majority of scholars, you will find, as I have stated, claim indisputably the events occur under Antiochus Epiphanes to Verse 30; but after Verse 30 it is a little hazy, and you cannot group them all around Antiochus Epiphanes. Modern

scholars have attempted to do it. Verse 30 speaks of the defiling of the temple. But we will come to that a little later on. In the career of Antiochus Epiphanes there is a kind of a little wheel within a wheel. There are events in his life which are very like what is predicted of the little horn --extremely alike, and I do not know why we could not consider this in the same way that Ezekial expresses it -- a wheel within a wheel. Just to illustrate: The things said about the little horn of Daniel 7 can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes in a small way. He is the eleventh down the line, three were plucked up in his place (names were mentioned), he did speak great words against the Most High, he did wear out the saints of the Most High in a small way, he did change the law of the Most High; things were given into his hand for just a time, times, and a half in a literal sense, which was three and one-half years. And in a very small way Antiochus Epiphanes might have been the little horn. So, suppose you and I had been living in that day we would have thought that that prophecy met its fulfillment to us, and we should have been sustained through that hour of persecution. In a small way I think this can apply to Antiochus Epiphanes. But in verse 30 we pass on to Rome, the great anti-Christ, of which Antiochus was ~~was~~ here the ~~paraxaxixix~~ personal representative.

(Mention was made of Josephus Book 12, Chapter 5, paragraph 3, but a question interrupted)

ELDER DANIELLS: You would not want to say that that you have just said now to a class of students, would you?

PROF. LACEY: I do not think that I would ever say it.

ELDER DANIELLS: I hope you won't, because the next thing you know some of our boys will be out over the country saying that that is the little horn.

VOICE: They have said it already.

PROF. LACEY: I have never said it. But I do not see why you object if we take this prophecy as a wheel within a wheel.

ELDER DANIELLS: When we come to the discussion, that will come in.

PROF. LACEY: Pass on to verse 23: "At the time appointed he shall return and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter."

At the time appointed Antiochus, perceiving that his cunningly planned scheme failed --that is, to get these two loggerheads fighting against each other, and seeing that Ptolemy and his brother Eusalus had made up and were prepared to resent his aggressions, he was so offended that he immediately made war and laid siege first to the two brothers of Alexandria. But this expedition was not as his former one, for the reasons given in the next verse.

Let me re-read this verse with the names opposite: "At the time appointed." Two years later, this is where he comes to his end, -- both of the kings come to an end, and Rome arises. "At the time appointed (B.C. 168) he (Antiochus Epiphanes) shall return and come toward the South (Egypt), and it (the Egyptian campaign), shall not be as the former (campaign -- the Egyptian campaign of verse 25), or as the latter (the Jewish campaign of verse 28). Notice why--

Verse 30: "For the ships of Chittim shall come against him" -- the ships of Chittim apply to the Romans, in Italy, the term being applicable to that whole coastal region -- they "shall come against him: therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do" -- and the verse proceeds.

Now we would like to know just what did occur just at that junction. "The ships of Chittim shall come against him (Antiochus Epiphanes)." While pressing the seige of Alexandria, a Roman embassy reached him and demanded that he desist instantly from his war with Ptolemy and Eulasus. Marcus Popillius Lenae, the head of the embassy, was the old friend of Antiochus, but he drew a circle in the sand around the king, and preemptorily demanded in the name of the Senate and Roman people that he give an immediate answer to the stipulations. As the report of the Battle of Vgdna, 168 B.C., had just been carried to Antiochus, he assented at once to the request of Popillius, and returned from Alexandria. So we see this campaign was not like the other two. -- He was pressing the seige, but he was demanded to withdraw, and he obeyed.

This is where Rome comes in contact with Antiochus in the same way that Greece and Persia came together. In that verse Rome and Greece come together. Just a moment longer we follow Antiochus, for it says "he shall be grieved and return." Does that say to his own land? No. Just "he shall be grieved and return. Now Polybius uses almost the exact language: "He led back his forces into Syria, grieved and groaning, but thinking it expedient

to yield to demands for the present." -- That is the history, it is not the prophecy -- "grieved and groaning, but thinking it expedient to yield to demands for the present."

ELDER DANIELLS: Where historians use practically the same thing that the prophet used, you consider that some weight of evidence, do you, that the history meets the prophecy?

PROF. LACEY: O yes, in a case like this. Not just an isolated reference.

The next expression: "and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do." On his way back this Antiochus further vented his spite and his ill temper upon the unfortunate Jews, despatching Apolloneus with 30,000 men to Jerusalem, who slew great multitudes, plundered the city, set fire to it in various places, pulled down houses and walls, slew those who attended the temple, defiled again the Holy Place so that the whole service was discontinued, the city was forsaken of the Jews and strangers only remained in it. On his arrival at Antioch he published a decree obliging all upon pain of death to conform to the religion of the Greeks. So the Jewish law was abrogated, and heathen worship was set up in its stead, and the temple itself was consecrated to Jupiter Olympius.

QUESTION: What was the date of that?

ANSWER: B.C. 168

PROF. LACEY: "They set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar. They did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of God." 1 Mac. 1:54, 59.

You see that they placed the abomination of desolation in the Holy Place. The very language of the Bible, "the abomination of desolation," is placed in the temple; and this is history. I do not see why you object to taking this in a small way as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, --as a wheel within a wheel view of this prophecy. Living in those times we would have thought that the prophecy met its fulfillment, but in this time we see it has a larger fulfillment, we get a present message from it; and we read any chapter and make other slight allusion to those days and how it applies today. Sister White herself recognized the double application method.

"And he (Antiochus) had intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant." That is, Antiochus had intelligence with those who forsook the holy covenant, for there were many Jews who complied with his request and became converts to heathenism.

M. C. WILCOX: The Revised Version says "Regard."

Verse 31: "And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate." Here I do not see why we cannot take the word which some of you prefer --"Out of him yet shall stand." Exactly the same word is used as in Daniel 8:9, when you come down to the Greek power, and out of the four horns, out of one of them a little horn waxed exceeding great. That "out of one of them" is the same word, and when we explain that we say that that little horn is Rome, and it came out of Greece

not racially and ethically, but it was incorporated and rose a universal power. So here we have the same point -- Out of him, or out of this power, shall come arms; another view of Rome. There is clearly strength and consistency in this view. We have not once doubled back on our track. We have made a steady march down. It is uninteresting history, but the Lord has given us these details, and they carry us right on down, so that the people in those days living as they were in that terrible time of persecution might have help, and now we come down to the latter part, which applies more essentially to us. Rome arises.

QUESTION: Did the people back there know anything at all about the book of Daniel -- wasn't it a sealed book?

PROF. LACEY: I do not know that it is just right to think that the sealing meant that they were to know nothing about the book of Daniel. They must have understood something about it. When it said that the goat was Greece, they must have understood that. When Alexander came to Jerusalem the high priest went out and pointed out the prophecy of Daniel to Alexander, and said, You are the horn of the goat.

PROF. SORENSON: Mentioned the text "Whoso readeth let him understand."

PROF. LACY (continuing study) "Out of them arms shall stand up." Arms for this power which followed Rome shall stand up or shall arise.

M. G. WILCOX: Refers to a translation which says "After him shall arms stand up."

PROF. LACEY: Many have repudiated the translation, but good scholars have accepted it.

(Elder Daniells requests that there be an uninterrupted continuation or presentation of the study)

PROF. LACEY: Out of him -- meaning emerging from that power, arising out of Greece, represented first by Antiochus, from his "arms" -- a wonderful symbol of the Roman empire. He included both the king of the north and the king of the south, and so he is not called the king of the north -- it is "arms." The north and the south were in arms. It is Rome Pagan and Papal in this chapter, and the duality is suggested by that term "arms." On the Roman standard, as I pointed out, two arms or extended hands were printed -- a striking symbol of Rome. By a natural transition the thought of the prophet passes from this Seleucidaen king to that of the Romans, who came into prominence in the very year brought to view in the previous verse -- B.C. 168.

Now these arms, this power shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and this has a double aspect. Pagan Rome, imperial Rome, polluted the earthly sanctuary of strength, and that section of this power represented by "arms", or Papal or ecclesiastical Rome, polluted the heavenly sanctuary of strength; the former in the year A.D. 70, and the latter, if we want to fix a date, in the year 503. That is the date accepted as we understand for the taking away of the daily mediation in the sanctuary. Anticipate that just as soon as Rome is struck in this line of prophecy, then the commentaries which are presented by the same authorities ~~xxxxxx~~ on Daniel 8 and 9 emphasis should be laid on the warfare raised by this power on the sanctuary of God in its

double aspect.

"And they shall place the abomination of desolation." There the Pagan element gradually disappears, and they place the ~~the~~ abomination that maketh desolate -- when Rome, or the Papacy, rather, was established in the year 533 to 538, by the decree of Justinian.

May I state at this juncture that that matter ----- is perfectly authentic. The matter was raised the first day as a question, and I did not like to say anything because I wanted to look it up. I had a copy of it, but you have to read 35 or 36 pages more beyond the place where the letter of Justinian to the Pope is mentioned; letter to ----- Bishop of Constantinople.

And so the year 533, this is an established date. We are brought down to that. Let us pass rapidly down over the following verses:

Verse 32: "And such ~~as~~ do wickedly against the covenant shall be ~~corrected~~ by flatteries. (The Papacy would win over those apostate Christians who proved disloyal to the covenant. We have shown that this is ~~the~~ correctly Papal Rome.) But the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits." Here the saints of God are brought to view; the faithful saints of God living during the dark ages, who maintained the faith of Christ, -- the Waldensers, Albigenses, Hugonots, etc. And so this prophecy is fulfilled.

Verse 33: Those "which understand among the people shall instruct many." This refers to the teaching of the

various reformers--Wycliffe, Huss, Jerome, Luther, etc. And those "that understand among the people shall instruct many (as against the Papacy), and yet they (the saints of God) shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, days." It does not say "time, times, and the dividing of time," but "days," which includes that. It may refer to that entire period of persecution suffered by the people of God, the 1260 years, when millions were martyred, but it is also a general statement, referring to the people of God, the saints of God.

(LACEY--Cont'd)

"The time of the end" The time of the end, according to the book of Daniel is 1844. Let us read Daniel 8:13, 14, 17-19. I do not say it could not be 1798 just as well.

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

Now the time brought to view here is 1844.

Vs. 17: "So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision." The Revised Version says: "The vision belongeth to the time of the end."

What is the great objective of the vision of Daniel 8 and 9? 1844. It belongs to the time of the end. Then the time of the end (according to this new application) is 1844.

Vs. 19: "And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be." Revised Version reads: "It belongeth to the appointed time of the end." By this then before we come to the 11th chapter the time of the end is referred to as 1844.

Vs. 35 (R. V.) "Because it was yet for the time appointed."

The true indication here is that on this side of

1798 there may be a revival of persecution—to that time, and into it.

Vs. 36: (11th chap.): "And the king shall do according to his will—" We must insist that the Hebrew rendering of the word "king" is "the king". ~~Amazin~~ Any other rendering of it is a twisting of the word.—"The King" was the king represented by the arms of Rome, as it was just assuming its papal form. Pagan Rome is passing away.—"And the king shall do according to his will." --And in the verses which follow we have an exposition of the character of the papal system.—"---shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god,."--How has he done this? In Rome the Pope sits with his foot upon the altar in St. Peter's, upon which the Host is elevated. The Host they conceive to be Christ recreated. He is placed upon the altar and the Pope sits with his feet upon that altar.

"And shall magnify himself above every God." There has been no heathen god honored as the Pope of Rome has been honored. And it could include the very God of heaven, too. He has magnified himself against God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, by taking away the continual mediation and calling attention to himself instead of to Christ, claiming he (the pope) was the vice-regent of God. The prophecy would far more fittingly apply to him than to the French nation.

He was to speak marvellous things against the God of gods. This is a parallel expression to that found in Daniel 7:8, 12, 27. There it says the little horn would speak great things, and then

very great things. Revelation 13:6 says: "And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his ~~temples~~ tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven." Take the claims of infallibility of the Bishop of Rome for instance, and the doctrine that the priests have power to create their Creator. They point to that as the wonderful power that is vested in the Roman priesthood.

~~Exxxix~~: "And shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished." He shall prosper till the indignation is accomplished, that is, down to the falling of the plagues,

"for that is determined shall be done."

Vs. 37: "Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers."

The Hebrew word reads (for 'regard') "to understand" "to attend"

"Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of of women,"ⁿ That does not mean that he denies the desire of women nor denies there is any god. It means he shall not "attend" to them; he will not heed them. How has the Papacy done that. To regard God is to worship him, to obey him, to worship him. How does he speak to me? In his word, The Word of God is the Bible; and we disregard God when we disregard the bible. Now it is a significant fact that the Bible has been eliminated in the Papal system. It always tries to keep the Bible away from the people. It does not "attend" to God or "regard" God. Now no matter what the history has been,--the papacy claims that it has changed the law of God--the Sabbath. By its own claims it has "disregarded" the law of God--disregarded God who made that law, the Creator of Heaven and earth, and whose law is a sign of his authority.

It does not mean that he denies the being of God, but disregards God.

We would never have thought of ~~that~~ ^{the} old view of applying this prophecy to the French nation if it had not been suggested in "Thoughts on Daniel"

"Nor the desire of women." What is one of the cardinal teachings of the Papal system? The celibacy of the priesthood and the virginity of the nuns.

"Nor regard any god." The papacy does not regard any god. It is entirely irreligious in spirit.

H C LACEY: This celibacy of the priests, involving the virginity of the nuns, which follows as a natural consequence, is one of the great items in the papal doctrine. He does not regard any god, that is, he is entirely irreligious in spirit. Now it is this to which Paul alludes in 2 Thess 2:4: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."

Notice how it says here [in Daniel] "neither shall he regard any god, for he shall magnify himself above all." This is the thought quoted in 2 Thess. We never deviate from applying that to the papacy, and this in Daniel which is the basis of the verse in Thessalonians, should also be applied to the papacy.

"But in his estate". Instead of calling his attention to the God of the Bible, he shall honor the God of forces. It is a very peculiar word translated forces. The Hebrew is Mahossen, meaning, "god protect us." He shall honor the god of forces. What are the facts of the case? The Catholics have thought to turn to the saints. Every Catholic has some saint to whom he or she looks. The saints come instead of Christ and God. And they are known as the tutelary saints. Perhaps I would better read something from some of these authorities on this point. In the ages past, repeatedly cities have been placed under the protection of certain guardian saints, tutelary deities, of those cities. They have trusted in the relics of the saints they have with them for protection. It will be impossible to find a word more descriptive of that than the word Mahossen.

Bishop Newton in his book "Newton of Prophecy" pages 304-306, has a very good summary of what has been written on this. The last chapter of Sir Isaac Newton's work is quoted entirely, and there are other elaborate extracts. Bishop Newton has summed it up a little. (Reading from page 303 of "Bishop Newton on the Prophecies," and onward:)

"But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces, (or Mahuzzim;) and a God whom his fathers knew not, shall he honour with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things."

. . . "The word Mahuzzim is taken personally, and is retained in several translations. It is derived from a radical verb signifying he was strong; and the proper meaning of it is, munitions, bulwarks, fortresses: but the Hebrews often using abstracts for concretes, it signifies equally protectors, defenders, and guardians, as Mr. Mede hath shown in several instances. This being the derivation and signification of the word, the verse may literally be translated thus: And the god Mahuzzim in his estate shall he honour; even a god whom his fathers knew not, shall he honour with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and desirable things." . . . "However is be translated, the meaning evidently is, that he should establish the worship of Mahuzzim, of protectors, defenders, and guardians. He should worship them as God, or with God: and who is there so little acquainted with ecclesiastical history, as not to know that the worship of saints and angels was established both in the Greek and Latin church? They were not only invocated and adored as patrons, intercessors, and guardians of mankind; but festival days were instituted to them; miracles were ascribed to them; churches were

erected to them; their very relics were worshipped; and their shrines and images were adorned with the most costly offerings, and 'honoured with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and desirable things.' And what renders the completion of the prophecy still more remarkable is, that they were celebrated and adored under the title of Mahuzzim, of bulwarks and fortresses, of protectors and guardians of mankind. Mr. Mede and Sir Isaac Newton have proved this point by a great variety of authorities cited from the fathers and other ancient writers. . . . Chrysostome, in his thirty-second homily upon the epistle to the Romans, speaking of the relics of Peter and Paul: 'This corpse,' saith he, meaning of Paul, 'fortifies that city of Rome, more strongly than any tower, or than ten thousand rampires, as also doth the corpse of Peter.'

Instance after instance of this kind is cited along here, showing that the saints were looked on as the god of forces. [speaking of Gian Pietro Caraffa.] Macaulay has a sentence that touches on this: "Poor, obscure, without a patron, without recommendations, he entered the city where now two princely temples, rich with painting and many-colored marble, commemorate his great services to the Church; where his form stands sculptured in massive silver; where his bones enshrined amidst jewels, are placed beneath the altar of God."

That is characteristic. "A god whom his fathers knew not shall
 honor with gold, and silver, and precious stones, and pleasant
 things. Thus shall he do in the most strong holds." We have these
 great cathedrals in the great cities. St. Peter's at Rome, and for
 many years St. Paul's in Great Britain, and St. Sofia in Con-
 stantinople. So in these great capitals of the earth they have
 these relics. So "shall he do in the most strong holds with a
 strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory."
 Whether we apply these to the tutelary saints or to the wafer
 itself, we do not go outside of the Catholic church. It is a
 strange god. "He shall cause them to rule over many, and shall
 divide the land for gain." He shall cause them (these saints)
 to rule over many. We have every country with its patron saint,
 England, St. George, Scotland, St. Andrew, Ireland, St. Patrick,
 France, St. Dennis, Spain, St. James, and so on. "He shall
 cause them to rule," that is, in the minds of the people, "and
 shall divide the land for gain." I don't need to allude to the
 wealthy possessions of the Roman Church, their landed estates
 and other riches. The Roman Church is valued at hundreds of
 millions of money. Here we have the verses descriptive of the
 character and creed of the papal system from verses 36-40.
 Every specification is remarkably fulfilled.

Verse 40. "And at," or in -- it is the little word be, and
 means at or in, "the time of the end." From that time down. If
 we take 1798, it is some time this side of 1898 1798, that period
 which is set off from the end of the world. If we regard this as
 an interpretation of Daniel 7, 1798 is good, but if we regard it
 as from Daniel 8, 1844 is better. "The king of the south" shall

at that time push at him." Here we are on unfulfilled ground. Some time this side of 1798 or 1844, the king of the south is to push at him, and so there emerges a new development. The king of the south must be the same power as that in the early part of the chapter, and the king of the south is some power that controls Egypt. I suppose today it is Great Britain, but anything beyond this point is speculation entirely. I have no notes on these verses. Before I came this morning I jotted down some things, but whatever we write has to be revised. Some of the men who held this view in Great Britain, inasmuch as England was the king of the south and Germany was the king of the north, they said, Germany is going to conquer England. But we see how that turned out. I don't think we ought to be precise like that. The papacy happened to stand for the Central Powers, and some of our general brethren were rather confident in the thought that Germany would conquer. It is a mistake to be precise when the Bible is not precise. Some time the king of the south shall push at him, or the papacy. It must be the papacy. We are not to speculate, but let us know one thing, that the developments justify this interpretation, because the king of the south may yet do that.

England may give independence to the king of the south. England is very much interested in the Mohammedans. I suppose that in a sense we might call her a helping power.

"The king of the south shall push at him." I want you to notice the strength of these words. One of the weak points in the old view is that push means to offer but feeble resistance. The word "push" is used everywhere to represent strength. It speaks of the oxen pushing. And in Daniel 8:4 it says, "I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward." Does push mean there to offer a feeble resistance?

M.C.WILCOX (reading): "so that no beast might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and became great."

A. G. DANIELLS: Could not pushing be used to mean offering resistance?

H. C. LACEY: That is not the way it is used. Read Psalm 44:5: "Through thee will we push down our enemies; through thy name will we tread them under that rise up against us."

A.G.DANIELLS: Isn't that resistance?--resisting the enemy?

H.C.LACEY: We are to resist the devil when he attacks us, when he pushes at us. That is the way these words are used,--an ox pushes, "the king of the south shall push at him."

G. B. THOMPSON: What is the antecedent of him?

H. C. LACEY: The power brought to view in the preceding verse.

G.B.THOMPSON: Him stands for the king of the north?

H.C.LACEY: I think so. The king of the north is not only just the papacy as a religious system. It is that beast supported by the ten horns of Revelation 17, verses 12 and 13: "And the ten horns

which thou sawest, are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast."

That refers to the time when the league of nations recognizes the papacy as one of the great spiritual factors. Then there will be fulfilled the prophecy that they will give their power and strength unto the beast. Some one has told us--and you know who it is--that the final movements will be rapid ones, and this verse may be fulfilled with great rapidity.

Let us read on: ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ "The king of the south (Egypt) shall push (aggressively attack) at him; and the king of the north (combination of powers with the papacy) shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over."

G.B.Thompson: Is that him the same as the first one?

H.C.MAGEY: It means the northern powers, the kingdoms of Europe, as against the southern powers. Whatever may be done with Palestine makes no difference. They pass right over, and the European nations are dominant. Certain kings of east are to rise against the kings of the west at some time. "He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries; and the land of Egypt shall not escape."

WILCOX: "Tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him:" The king of the north is the papacy supported by these nations. The great point is the papacy, the little horn, supported by these ten kingdoms. Of course the papacy does not do anything just of itself, as a church. These political powers support

the papacy. It is the powers that do the work.

F.M.WILCOX: You understand the papacy is the antecedent of all those pronouns, he and him?

H.C.LACEY: Yes, along here. The king of the south, of course, is the Mohammedan powers. (Reads 43d verse) "But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt: and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many."

The heathen world, perhaps Japan and China, shall trouble him, but the European nations will never submit. "They shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many." And right in connection with that, he "shall plant the tabernacles of his palace [no one knows just what that means] between the seas in the glorious holy mountain."

A.G.DANIELLS: Where is that?

Jerusalem.

H.C.LACEY: The glorious holy mountain is ~~Exzskina~~. The point is that the European powers supporting the papacy are victorious, and they establish themselves in Jerusalem. I do not understand this to mean that the Roman church is going to change its headquarters from Rome down to Jerusalem, but they ~~xxx~~ plant the tabernacles of their palace there, and that is the second city in the Roman system. But Jerusalem is where Jesus died, and all the holy places are there. They are victorious, and make Jerusalem a papal city, chiefly; and yet Jews will be there, Greek Catholics will be there. We want to read in that same connection Isaiah 2 and Micah 4.

"Yet he shall come to his end (this papal power, king of the north) and none shall help him." That is a parallel to these other

expressions where it speaks of his being "broken without hand."
At that time Michael shall stand up, Christ takes His throne.

E.R.PALMER: Did I understand correctly that the ten horns of Revelation 17 are represented by the ten kings of Western Europe?

H.C.LACEY: I understand those are just a general representation of the division of Rome.

A.G. DANIELLS: We thank you very much, Brother Lacey, for this presentation of the matter. I have greatly enjoyed this study.

H.C.LACEY: I think we have had a very sweet time here together, and I do not want you to think that I am back of this, trying to drive it. Years ago I heard of it, and studied it from time to time. There are some things in it that look very impressive and conclusive. But if it is demonstrated that the old view is the right one, I shall hold to it.

(After considerable discussion, it was agreed that Professor Prescott should take the first 45 minutes in the afternoon to present his view of this prophecy.)

THREE P. M. SESSION

W.W.PRESCOTT: It may be proper that I should in a general way state my position so that I may be understood in dealing with it as far as possible. My personal position is this:--I would prefer that the old position should prevail. That is my personal attitude and feeling. When we have fully committed ourselves to a position, I would rather we would not have to change it. That is my personal feeling about it. X

There are only two prophecies that I recall, that we have taken out of the Scriptures and made the subject of special publication, for each one. One is Matthew 24 from the New Testament, and this eleventh of Daniel from the Old Testament. We have circulated hundreds of thousands of copies of that on Matthew 24, and we generally agree that the interpretation of the book is wrong there. We have printed and circulated hundreds of thousands on this position. Now personally I would rather we would be able to go on as we have without change. That is my personal attitude toward it, but I got into serious personal difficulty with the Scriptures in trying to go on. I used to preach the eleventh of Daniel in accordance with the view set forth in "Thoughts on Daniel" but as I studied further I got into such difficulty with it that I stopped preaching it and haven't preached that or any other view since. Perhaps what I shall say to you this afternoon will indicate the difficulties into which I got in the desire to really maintain the old view. Then you can understand in general my present position.

Dan. 1:1. "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it". This book breaks right into history as if we were perfectly familiar with all that goes before it. And it

breaks in by bringing two cities to view and two kings. Babylon, and Jerusalem; Jehoiakim and Nebuchadnezzar. I stop right there to find the connection in it which the Prophet Daniel broke with his book because we must have some understanding of Babylon and Jerusalem, the king of Babylon and the king of Jerusalem, if we are going to break into history this way; or else how can we understand what he is talking about? I cannot stop to go into details; I will merely make suggestions as time will not permit more.

I went into the Bible on this subject and began with Jerusalem in Judges 1:8, the first place it is referred to as a city and have made a sweep clear through the Bible, and find we have Jerusalem from Judges 1:8, to Revelation 21 and 22, and Daniel breaks right into that. He has his place right there in that whole long setting.

I took Babylon and started from the 11th of Genesis and find we have it continually before us until we come to the 18th of Revelation where it is destroyed. This breaks into that history and suggests a controversy between the two cities, and it breaks into that controversy in a particular time under special circumstances and makes its contribution as it were, on this subject. Then I must have an interpretation of Daniel's contribution to this subject of the controversy between Babylon and Jerusalem that will fit into what the others tells us about it,-- history and the other prophecies. Then I have what would seem to me a consistent interpretation of the prophecies. If I make an interpretation of what Daniel says that does not fit in with what the others say, it is not consistent.

I find that the principle of Babylon from the very first is to exalt one's self in place of God,--to further selfishness, and atheism. This I find to be characteristic of Babylon from

the first time Babylon is mentioned with a description in the 11th of Genesis. I followed that right through. I came to a time when ancient Babylon falls out, but while Babylon of the East dies, Babylon of the West lives, and Babylon is still with us. And I find that the whole controversy is over the question of the supremacy of the world,--the kingdom question. ~~Isxxx~~ It is whether Babylon shall be the capital of the world, and rule the world, or whether Jerusalem shall be the ruling power. The question of world supremacy is the question to be settled all the way through. I find that the first call out of Babylon was in Genesis 12:1-3 when Abram was called out of Babylon, to leave his kindred and friends. That was Ur of the Chaldees. The first call to get away from Babylon was for absolute separation. Get out of thy country, thy kindred, and thy father's house, and out loose entirely from everything there. The last call out of Babylon is in the 18th of Revelation. And I find that that last call by its very wording shows that it is just before the final downfall of Babylon which is in verses 4-6. "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities."

The first call was ~~xxxx~~ when God called Abram out of his country. The last call is given in the loud cry of this last message, and we are still having it to deal with.

Now when we read the prophets of the different periods we find that they had definite purposes in view. The prophets that spoke in their times were very clearly trying to save the people of God of their times from that idolatry which would make them the prey of their enemies around them. Their strength and protection was in God. Apostasy would place them as a prey to the enemies

around about them. Prophets were warning them of formalism, departing from God and adopting the religion of the peoples around them, and thus being disloyal to their covenant with God, telling them what the consequences of that would be. First there were seven prophets during what we might call the Assyrian period, trying to save Jerusalem from Assyria. They gave their warnings, and it is significant that Assyria did not prevail over Jerusalem. You remember the final crisis in the time of Hezekiah when Sennacherib was there, but he did not prevail over Jerusalem. Then there were four two branches of the kingdom, Jerusalem and Israel. Four prophets came to Israel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, and Micah. And four to Jerusalem; Joel, Obadiah, Isaiah, and Micah. Micah may be said to be a prophet for both. Then came the prophets of the Babylon period. Their prophecies were directed to Judah; Nahum, Habbakkuk, Zephaniah. Then those of the exile, Ezekiel and Daniel. Then those of the restoration, Haggai, Zechariah, and possibly Malachi.

Here is where Daniel comes in. All these prophets before him had tried to save them from being overthrown by their enemies, and Jerusalem was not overthrown by Assyria. Babylon became her successor and then attention was directed to saving Jerusalem from Babylon. Israel was carried away by Assyria, but Jerusalem was not. But the prophets did not succeed in saving Jerusalem from Babylon. God said he sent his messengers to them rising up early, but they would not heed them and despised his prophets until the wrath of God arose and there was no remedy. Then came the captivity, that most fearful crisis in the history of God's people, a crisis from which they never fully recovered. It is just at that time in exile that Daniel prophesies.

What are the circumstances? Babylon has conquered Jerusalem. The purpose is not now to save them from Babylon, they are in Babylon. What then is the objective point in this prophecy? We might spend much time on that, but I think a main objective of the prophecy of the book of Daniel is to save God's people from modern Babylon. You see there is a parallel. First the prophets tried to save Israel. Israel was carried captive by Assyria. Then Judah was carried off by Babylon, and they did not succeed in saving Judah from Babylon, here come the prophets in the exile, Ezekiel and Daniel. What is the purpose of the prophecy of Daniel? What is the subject of the book? The Gospel of the Kingdom. And it also deals with the foes of the kingdom. In all the warnings of the danger of being captured by their enemies, we find reference to the true gospel. It is just so in the book of Daniel. On the positive side the gospel of the Kingdom of God. On the warning side, warnings against the foes of the kingdom of God, and the effort to save God's people from these enemies. Before Daniel's time it was to save his the ancient people. Now Ancient Babylon has actually conquered Jerusalem and the outward appearances are that the kingdom of Jerusalem has come to an end, judging as the heathen would. That was evidently Nebuchadnezzar's view when he took the trophies from Jerusalem and put them in the house of his god. It was at that time that the prophecies of Daniel were given. The announcement of the kingdom of God in spite of all that looked to the contrary, and with that the warnings against the enemies of the kingdom that will seek to overthrow it and bring in apostasy and prevent God's purpose. Up to Daniel's time it was ancient Babylon. Now we find that ancient Babylon has conquered Jerusalem. Now founded upon the experience of that very time, chapters 1 to 6,

the specifically prophetic portion looks forward now and are **367**
warnings in behalf of the people of God against modern Babylon,
and his prophecy, with the book of Revelation supplementing and
enlarging upon the fourth and fifth kingdoms are given to enable
the people of God to avoid being ~~xxx~~ overcome by this enemy and
carried into apostasy and disloyalty by this same Babylon in
modern guise.

Now just to outline the time when this was given and
show the purpose, I will read some Scriptures so we will get
this picture.

Job 37:31-33.

Psa. 48:1,2.

Psa. 75:4,7.

Matt. 5:35.

Judges 6:22,23.

1 Sam. 8:7.

Ezekiel 1:4.

Exodus 26:35.

Exodus 25:30.

Lev. 1:11.

Matt. 27:33.

Job 37:21, 23: "And now man see not the bright light which is in the clouds: but the wind passeth, and cleanseth them. Fair weather cometh out of the north: with God is terrible majesty. Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out: he is excellent in power, and in judgment, and in plenty of justice: he will not afflict."

You have this suggestion as to the dwelling place of God.
"Golden splendour comes out of the north." (RV)

Ps. 48: 1, 2, : "Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness. Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King."

If God's people had remained loyal to him, Jerusalem would have been the capital of the world, and God himself would have dwelt there, just as he will in the New Jerusalem. It is the idea of the Great King that is brought out here.

Ps. 75:4-7: "I said unto the fools, Deal not foolishly: and to the wicked, Lift not up the horn: Lift not up your horn on high: speak not with a stiff neck. For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south."

If promotion does not come from the east, west, or south, where does it come from? The north. This promotion, this lifting up, comes from God, whose dwelling place is the north.

Matt. 5:35: "Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King."

May I just drop a word for your thought. There is a variation of quite The magnetic north is not the same as the polar north.

a large number of degrees. If you take a vertical needle which is free to swing, and you start up toward that magnetic north, it will gradually tip until it points directly up to the magnetic north pole. Now no one can explain that. He can simply say that according to the best science there are certain currents of influence that tend in that direction, and this magnetic needle answers to them. The ordinary needle that you survey with must be corrected for that tendency to tip up. We have also the vertical needle, and it will respond to these currents. There is something for you to think about as the connection between science and revelation, between actual observable facts and some of the things we are reading.

Judges 8:22, 23: "Then the men of Israel said unto Gideon, Rule thou over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son's son also: for thou hast delivered us from the hand of Midian. And Gideon said unto them, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: the Lord shall rule over you."

The idea of the kingship of God over his people.

1 Sam. 8:7: "And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them."

The idea of the direct kingship of God over his people. Up to this time we may say there was a pure theocracy. After this time there was a theocratic monarchy.

Ezek. 1:4: "And I looked, and, behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof as the color

of amber, out of the midst of the fire."

This was Ezekiel's view of the throne of God, and you see this idea of the location.

Ex. 26:35: "And thou shalt set the table without the veil, and the candlestick over against the table on the side of the tabernacle toward the south: and thou shalt put the table on the north side."

Ex. 25:30: "And thou shalt set upon the table shewbread before me alway."

What is the other expression for shewbread? Bread of presence, especially with reference to that idea of presence. That is what is brought out in Ex. 25:30.

Lev. 1:11: "And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the Lord: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall sprinkle his blood round about upon the altar."

That burnt offering was to be killed on the side of the altar northward.

Matt. 27:33: "And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull,"

Have you ever noticed that Golgotha was on the north side of Jerusalem? I don't want to dwell on these things, I simply want to suggest these for you to see that there is something in the scriptures dealing with these in many ways and cases that we must not disregard. Now we come to the other side.

Isa. 14: 12-14: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of

God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High."

Isa. 14:4: "That thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!"

The 12th and 14th verses are a part of this whole chapter. When you come to the 12th verse, this one who was to be cast down is named Lucifer, or the day star.

Isa. 14:22: "For I will rise up against them, saith the Lord of hosts, and cut off from Babylon the name, and remnant, and son, and nephew, saith the Lord."

What I saw in this chapter was that Lucifer is the invisible king of Babylon, and his place is the sides of the north. God was the invisible king of Jerusalem, and intended to remain so, but they demanded a visible king, so from Samuel's time they broke away from the invisible king and had a visible king, but it was their downfall. Babylon has always had a visible king, but also an invisible king, Lucifer. He was the invisible king right down through, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, Rome pagan and papal, and used these visible powers to crush out the kingdom of God.

Jeremiah 46: 6-10: "Let not the swift flee away, nor the mighty man escape; they shall stumble, and fall toward the north by the river Euphrates. Who is this that cometh up as a flood, whose waters are moved as the rivers? Egypt riseth up like a flood, and his waters are moved like the rivers: and he saith, I will go up, and will cover the earth; I will destroy the city and the inhabitants thereof. Come up, ye horses; and rage ye chariots; and let the mighty

men come forth; the Ethiopians and the Libyans, that handle the shield; and the Lydians, that handle and bend the bow. For this is the day of the Lord God of hosts, a day of vengeance, that he may avenge him of his adversaries: and the sword shall devour, and it shall be satiate and made drunk with their blood: for the Lord God of hosts hath a sacrifice in the north country by the river Euphrates."

(PRESCOTT--Cont'd)

Reading: Jeremiah 25:8,9 "Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts; Because ye have not heard my words, Behold I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about and will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment, and an hissing, and perpetual desolations."

The north country was the River Euphrates--Babylon. We know that Daniel studied Jeremiah's prophecies because he got his time period when the people of God were to be restored to their own land from this prophecy. Here we have in Jeremiah not only the mention of this matter but a definite location and a definite connection--the north country--by the River Euphrates--king of Babylon--Nebuchadnezzar.

Ezekiel 26:7 "For thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and companies, and much people." Here is mentioned the king of Babylon from the north. That is the expression I want to bring in.

Zach. 2:6,7: "Ho, ho, come forth, and flee from the land of the north, saith the Lord: for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of ^{the} heaven, saith the Lord. Deliver thyself, O Zion, that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon."

Turn to another striking phase of this. Isa. 23

41:25: "I have raised up one from the north, and he shall come: from

the rising of the sun shall he call upon my name; and he shall come upon princes as upon mortar, and as the potter treadeth clay."

This prophecy foretold the coming of Cyrus. He was the one who overthrew Babylon. Now in ancient times tidings out of the east and north troubled Babylon. That is where the man came from that overthrew Babylon. Now I draw the same parallel in the prophecy of Daniel; tidings out of the north and east shall trouble him. That corresponds exactly with this prophecy of the one who should come to destroy Babylon.

Jer. 50:2,3: "Declare ye among the nations, and publish, and set up a standard; publish, and conceal not: say, Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken in pieces; her idols are confounded, her images are broken in pieces. For out of the north there cometh up a nation against her, which shall make her land desolate, and none shall dwell therein; they shall remove, they shall depart, both man and beast." Here we have a very definite prophecy of the overthrow of Babylon.

9th verse: "For lo, I will raise and cause to come up against Babylon an assembly of great nations from the north country: and they shall set themselves in array against her; from thence she shall be taken; their arrows shall be of a mighty expert man; none shall return in vain."

This is a peculiar setting of the prophecy that I could not understand for some time--Babylon spoken of as the king of the north, by the River Euphrates--the king of Babylon represented as the king of the north; and that out of the north Babylon would be destroyed. Now here is how

the solution came to me. I saw that the King of the north was God himself; that there was a false King of the North, -Babylon. Now the false king will be destroyed by the true King. On this basis, the false king will abide until the coming of the Lord, as Paul says (II. Thess. 2:8) "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." That will be when the Lord comes out of the north.

I will just offer the following scriptures (which I have not time to read) for your own study. In nearly all of these scriptures in Jeremiah it bears out this idea of the king of the north.

Jer. 1:13-15
 3:12,18
 4:6
 6:1,22
 10:22
 23:8
 25:8,9
 46:8, 10, 20, 24
 47:2
 50:2,3, 9, 41
 51:48

There are twenty places in Jeremiah where this setting is given. Daniel was written after this book, and undoubtedly Daniel himself was familiar with the prophecies in Jeremiah. And from Daniel's expressidh of the King of the North and the King of the South it was very difficult for me to see that that referred to any different meaning than the general mean'ng in this prophecy of Jeremiah, and it seemed to me I must get an entirely different meaning in order to make it harmonize.

Now when I remembered we were facing "Babylon". that that was the great question with us--not what we shall do with Turkey, but how to get people out of Babylon--a message against

the Beast and his Image, --I saw it all in a different light. That was what Daniel's book was given for--to bring people out of Babylon.

Now if we ~~may~~ see Daniel's book is to save people from Babylon, we shall see the purpose for which it was given. And we see this oneness of theme right through the book--this one setting.

Now I preferred to take the other position; and I used to preach it, but after I got to studying the whole theme of the book and when I came to read the history of this contest between the king of the north and the king of the south, and saw this contest was not something that started in the times of the prophecy of Daniel, but was spoken of by Jeremiah before him--how this king of the north would sweep up across Palestine clear up to the Euphrates River and subject everything on his way; then the king of Babylon came out and defeated the king of Egypt and swept clear down to Egypt; and it was in this sweeping back and forth that Judah was drawn into trouble because she all the time was fearful ~~that~~ of the north country. Babylon was east of Jerusalem, and when the king of Babylon came across Assyria (or Syria) the attack was always from the north. It was in these sweepings back and forth, and this fearfulness of Judah--where Judah got to the place where she trusted simply in material things instead of the Lord, and began to seek alliances with other countries. You remember that Ahaz made an alliance with the king of Assyria. Then you find Israel looking toward Egypt for help. Then we come to the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and Jehoiakin, the vassal of the king of Babylon is put on the

throne, showing the utter subservience of Israel to the king of Babylon. And it was when Jerusalem was in the hands of the king of the south that the king of the north took it.

These pictures in the book of Daniel are not new pictures but simply views of an old picture. Daniel does not define his terms. Jeremiah defines them. He puts into the ^{controversy} ~~paraphrase~~ the connecting point that started back in the time of Abraham; "Keep out of Babylon"—a controversy that continues today, in the message we are preaching to get the people out of Babylon.

When you come to the 18th chapter of Revelation it brings us to the utter overthrow of Babylon. The 19th chapter gives the hosannas of the saved, ^{because Babylon is fallen, fallen;} and the 21st chapter portrays the coming of the new Jerusalem and the reigning of the true King of the North, together with the final destruction of Babylon.

(Discussion followed)

PALMER: I want to ask a question that is troubling. I think I hold the old position. I have been troubled over this point as to what the real scriptural ~~xxxx~~ basis is for the terms "King of the North" and "King of the South" being derived geographically. It looks plausible, but I am not able to find any strong basis for the terms in the light of the Scriptures in general. We seem to build very largely upon the geographical location and I wonder if this is a sound basis.

BOLLMAN: Is not that answered by the 8th and 9th verses of Daniel Eight?

LACEY: Isn't it answered by Daniel 11:4

PRESCOTT: It appears to me that these terms used in Daniel are not new designations but they have been defined before, and he simply ~~xxxx~~ adopts these designations already in use.

As I view the matter- while I do not object to Brother Lacey's suggestion--what appears to be the governing thing is not geography but principle.

PALMER: That is my question. ~~ixnxixstaxixthaxaxixix~~
~~ixixixixxshaxix~~ The question is whether these terms originated in a certain geographical region or whether they originated in a principle,--for the conclusion would be far different in the two cases. In one case the king of the north perhaps would apply to a number of kings succeeding each other in geographical position, whereas, if we were to ~~ixnxixixxixixixixixix~~ apply them to principles the result might be quite different.

WIRTH: I think we have made a mistake in saying that the king of the north and the king of the south referred to Alexander's Empire. I do(not) think the central point is Jerusalem? The king of the north is the king of the north as it affects God's people--their city, Jerusalem; and the king of the south is the king of the south only as it affects Jerusalem--the land south of Jerusalem. Any power that would come in as a strong power against God's people from that direction would be called the king of the south; and any power that would come in from the north would be called the king of the north. And that is Babylon. Whenever Babylon came against Jerusalem it was always from the north country. And that is why in Jeremiah 50 and other places we always have Babylon spoken of as the king of the north. On the map Babylon is not north; but it is north of Jerusalem. The same thing is true of the south. The Hebrew rendering makes this rendering plain. That anything is north that is north of Jerusalem.

The great objective it seems to me is that God's people are the ~~santa~~ central things. Syria is called the kingdom of the north because it is situated north of Jerusalem, and Egypt is called the king of the south because it is situated south of Jerusalem.

LACEY: Isn't it true the the empire of Alexander comprised Macedon and Egypt? And when it says (verse 3) "a mighty king . . . will do according to his will", I understand that includes even Egypt and all Palestine. Now when he shall stand up his kingdom shall be broken and divided to the four winds of heaven--north, south, east and west of Jerusalem, as I always understood it. The empire of Alexander represents the world as divided into four parts, with Palestine as the center of this division.

DANIELLS: Alexander's kingdom was divided into four parts, and those parts were to fall away and be distinct parts in the four ~~parts~~ points of the compass.

M. C. WILCOX: We have nothing mentioned of the kingdom of the East; we make that the king of the north.

DANIELLS: The prophecy resolves these four into two and designates them. Now here is the point. The prophecy does say that the king of the north came against the king of the south, and the king of the south against the king of the north. Now what power--what kingdom fulfills that prophecy by name? Take the south?

LACEY: Egypt

DANIELLS: We can stand there.

Now what kingdom fulfilled that prophecy as to the king of the ~~santa~~ north?

LACEY: Syria under the Selucidae.

DANIELLS: Now there is your prophecy. There is plain language. There is the meaning of the parts if your statements are true. Did these two kings fulfill these verses?

WIRTH: They did.

DANIELLS: Then in the beginning of the prophecy Egypt and Syria ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ the kingdom of Ptolemy, -- ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ king ~~xxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxx~~ and Seleucus stood for the king of the south and the king of the north. That is where the prophecy starts. Now whatever else we may find in the Bible of the north and the south, are not parts of this prophecy. What is to say, when you come right to this specific thing in prophecy it must mean Ptolemy and Seleucus and their successors.

A.G.DANIELLS: I do not want to crowd any one's question out. I wanted to crystalize that and then get away from it.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I would like to ask if any one can give me a reason why the king of the north is not mentioned by name from the 15th verse to the 40th verse. Has any one noticed that in the prophecy and given it any special study? Why is the name omitted where before and after that you have the name?

A.G.DANIELLS: I suppose it is easier to give a reason for something God has told us than to give a reason for something he has not told us.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I do not see that applies.

C.S.LONGACRE: Isn't this the reason,--that the 14th verse introduces a new power that is not the king of the north, and deals with that power? The 14th verse introduces the Romans.

J.L.SHAW: Isn't it the same reason they have for all the rest of it? It doesn't tell who the king of the south is, either.

F. M. WILCOX: I would like to ask how Brother Prescott explains that. He probably has some idea.

W.W.PRESCOTT: I do not want to monopolize all the time.

M.C.WILCOX: Inasmuch as the laws of interpretation have been ~~maximized~~ touched upon, and we are going back to the first mention of it, let us read Job 37:22: "Fair weather cometh out of the north: with God is terrible majesty." The north is where God dwells. If we look to the apostate side, we go back to Isaiah 14:12-14, where the great apostate said, I sit as king in the sides of the north. That, it seems to me, would control; and so we have it perpetuated through the other books.

Now suppose Babylon had grown and grown and grown until it

from their homes for the purpose of breaking them loose from every family connection, and making them good fighters; and she almost overdid the thing, for they became such good fighters that they nearly did away ^{with} the empire. I cannot understand why we should make these two kings fulfill this prophecy when one, ~~was~~ the king of the north, was the "sick man of the east," and the king of the south was one leg of the king of the north. I do not believe that God wants us to put prophecies on any such basis as that.

And I do not believe he wants us to go two centuries before Christ to find the geography that will tell us what to do in the time of the end. I believe that when we find something that fulfills that prophecy we shall find a king of the north, and not a "sick man of the east." I believe we shall find a king of the south, and not a lot of Mamelukes that ~~was~~ never were a nation. I cannot see through that old interpretation. I have not heard one of those speeches for twenty years that has not put a pain in my soul, because I have felt that we would have to go back on some of those things. I have felt that there is something bigger than we have been looking for. That marvelous prophecy calls for a king of the north and a king of the south. Those powers do not meet the prophecy.

Now as to the question of geography: We do not hold to geographical lines in the other prophecies. I fear that we have been led astray on some of those things. Of course I do not propose to have any quarrel with any body about it, for I think we could finish this message without ever discussing this king of the north question, if we could just agree not to discuss it; but somehow or other we can not agree, and as long as we are going to discuss it, I believe we ought to have it out.

C.S.LONGACRE: I would like to ask a question on the great river Euphrates: Does it represent Turkey or Babylon the Great?

A.O.TAIT: Our brethren have taught that it represents Turkey.

H.C.WILCOX: Maybe we can tell better when we get over there when the sixth plague is poured out.

A.O.TAIT: The Turkish power has not been a king for 300 years. The Turkish power has not been a power in any sense of the word. It has been a puppet that has been holding territory that none of the rest of the powers in Europe was willing to let the others have. The Turkish power cannot answer to that prophecy.

A.G.DANIELLS: Didn't the Lord recognize that decaying process in the book of Revelation of that very power, the Turkish power,-- its drying up?

A.O.TAIT: Then I will throw in another question: We teach that he dried up or lost his dominion on August 11, 1840.

A.G.DANIELLS: Lost his dominion?

A.O.TAIT: He lost his independence August 11, 1840. We talk that, and then we just whirl right around and set him up there and say that "he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many, and we put that back in 1798. But, brethren, I cannot see it that way. I do not think that Napoleon Bonaparte ~~meets~~ meets these specifications at all. I think I am prepared to show very clearly from history that ~~that~~ he does not. Napoleon met the Turkish armies twice and destroyed them. They never gathered themselves after that. I do not see how you can have him lose his dominion in 1840 and be the king of the north in 1919.

A.G.DANIELLS: Where has it been published that he lost his dominion in 1840?

W.W.PRESCOTT: Go into the files of the Advent papers previous to 1840, and you will find that they said that in 1840 the Turkish empire would be destroyed, come to ~~his~~ end. But 1840 passed without his coming to his end, and then they stated that it lost its independence.

LACEY: I have in my hand Miller's lectures of 1839 and he says, "Whosoever lives until 1839 will see the final dissolution of the Turkish Empire."

WAKEHAM: I think there is some confusion with reference to what constitutes a king in prophecy. Whether it be a Republic, a monarchy, or an oligarchy, I think a government is considered a king in the Bible. When I was in Turkey, I found a government there, and a pretty strong one too. When you get in there you find yourself in the grip of a tyrant, one of the worst absolute monarchies in the world.

TAIT: My question was not what constitutes a king, but that he should dominate the north. It seems to me that calls for him to dominate the north.

WAKEHAM: He was doing it pretty thoroughly.

TAIT: Well, he may have held you while you were there, but he has only been doing what England and France and Germany and Russia would permit him to do. I do not see how you can make a power that has been in that sort of position all these years fulfill that prophecy that calls for a power from the North that will break away with great power and do tremendous things. I think we will see something in the near future that will make us realize that has something to it besides Turkey.

WALDORF: It seems to me in writing of the king of the north and the king of the south, it is from Jerusalem. Jesus says the queen king of the south came to visit Solomon. There was the idea that the territory below Jerusalem was the kingdom of the South, whether a queen or a king ruled there. Egypt was included and also the southern part of Arabia. The first prophecies were given in Jerusalem before they were taken into Babylonian captivity. And it says in the 4th of Jeremiah that the Kingdom of

the North was coming to take them captive, evidently referring to Babylon. That seems to be very clear as far as the kingdoms of the South and of the North were concerned.

Here is another question I wanted brought up this morning by Brother Lacey, and that is the two verses in the 13th chapter. To me they mean a good deal. I read here in the 6th verse. "And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swore by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished."

Now I cannot conceive, myself, that these two verses should be left alone in the interpretation of the rest of the book of Daniel, for I consider that these two verses contain the key. I cannot think that an angel from heaven would raise both hands to the Heavenly Father and take an oath upon it without having some meaning to it. There is an emphasis there, I think, that should be studied. I do not want to take your time, but I do wish to present one or two points to show that in everything in the universe, God works by mathematics and precision, and the same is true in chronology. I cannot think it will admit of sliding scales or periods of time. I can go back and give some twenty examples to show that ~~xxxxxx~~ prophecy was fulfilled on time, and I believe the prophecy of Daniel will be fulfilled on time. Here is the point I want to come to. To my mind, it is clear that the time and times and an half, refers to the

Papal persecution, referring to the same time spoken of in Daniel 7:25, from 538 to 1798. This period of time is also mentioned in Great Controversy" as the time of the end. The time of the end is distinctly mentioned in Daniel 11:40. And at the time of the end shall the king of the South push at him. This angel took an oath on it and said at the time of the end of the persecuting power of the Papacy, then these things should be finished. If we can locate this time, and I think we can, in 1798 when the Pope was taken prisoner we have a definite location and if we then look to find the king of the South pushing out against the king of the North, we find Egypt at war with France, and the king of the North, Turkey, came in like a whirlwind.

If we look for something else, we will have to get a different commentary on the 8th and 9th of Revelation, and another commentary on the 16th chapter also. For if there is to be a federation of all the European powers against the Eastern nations, and I believe that will come in this connection, then I ask the question how can it be possible that if the Papal power rules in Europe, that "tidings out of the North shall trouble him"? What nation is located in the Arctic sea? None. Take the 16th chapter. That federation which faces the Mohammedan or Eastern nations is under the Papacy. The 18th chapter will have to be rewritten, for during the plagues there is no federation. If we begin to move some of these strong, fundamental, mathematical dates of chronology, we will have to remove everything, I can see.

M.C. WILCOX: The question is from one angel to the other, how long shall it be to the end of these wonders. What

he has just been showing is the standing up of Michael, the resurrection of the dead and the shining forth of the righteous in the kingdom of the Father. And he inquires how long shall it be to the end of these wonders. I understand that in the Hebrew the word itself includes that. The answer is the time, times and the dividing of time. I do not think we have any question about the 1260 days. Brother Waldorf says it is the ending of the persecution of the Papacy.

LACEY: In one translation it says how long shall it be after this time.

M.C. WILCOX: It would seem to me that the last half of that sentence should be connected with what Daniel says himself. When they have made an end of breaking in pieces God's people, all these wonders, the resurrection and all, will come. On the other hand, back in the 7th of Daniel we read, I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them till the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High.

ANDERSON: I would like to say just a few words. It seems to me our fundamental difference is in getting to some common understanding as to how to deal with the prophecy. It seems to me that this is what we call predictive prophecy. The eleventh of Daniel, I believe, is predictive prophecy, which is quite different from what we call apocalyptic prophecy. That is in the first part of Daniel. Apocalyptic prophecy has little or no relation to history. Predictive prophecy moves along the line of historical facts and takes account of history, geography, and things that we deal with in the affairs of men. Apocalypses lose sight, as it were, of history, geography, and the ordinary

affairs of men. You take the fourteenth to eighteenth of Isaiah where he speaks about Tyre and Egypt and Moab. He deals with the actual things that can be seen and understood and laid hold of. They are more concrete. This is predictive prophecy. When he comes to the 24th chapter (of Isaiah), we are all in the air. You cannot find any history, geography, or anything. Of course he speaks of a city, but you cannot locate it. Now the same is true in Daniel. I would like to enlarge upon this for I think it will help us to get closer together. The apocalypse of the New Testament is very distinctly an apocalypse, though in the statements relating to the seven churches ^{it} ~~there~~ is a measure historical as we can find our grounds there, but possibly barring this, the rest of Revelation is what we call an apocalypse.

A.G. DANIELLS: Do you think this is true of the seven trumpets?

ANDERSON: I don't say you cannot locate them, but that it pays little attention to periodical events.

DANIELLS: But you don't think it is as clear as the seven churches?

ANDERSON: It locates the churches. That is why I differentiate there. There are several differences between these two numbers. The apocalypses deal much more largely in ^{symbolic} ~~stories~~ imagery, figures and symbols are very conspicuous in an apocalypse. In predictive prophecy, these play a much less conspicuous part. I suppose the reason back of this is--

I suppose that the reason back of this is that the man who wrote the Apocalypse wished only a certain class of readers to understand what was said. I think that John was writing to a certain class who would know just what he meant, and while at the same time people who didn't belong to that class would know nothing about it. So he said some very hard things about Rome, but he didn't dare do that in plain language. Take it in Acts and in the letters of Paul, some very conciliatory things are spoken about Rome.

Coming back to the distinction, I think we will find we are on peculiar ground in this eleventh of Daniel. It is predictive prophecy, and the writer starts us out on solid ground. He says, Here is this kingdom, and this kingdom, and from ~~diff-~~ference this beginning we can find where we are starting, and he takes us right straight along down the course of time, dealing with geographic facts, dealing with things that are closely related to the affairs of men, which is not true in the matter of the Apocalypse. So it seems to me that we all could come to this understanding that we are on good clear substantial ground at the beginning of this prophecy. He starts out with these kingdoms and this country and these facts, and takes us down through a long series in a very detailed way, for, of course, some very definite purpose. I am of the opinion that he gave those utterances, as you will find through nearly all predictive prophecy, that they rise out of some historical situation. The burden of that has its ground in some situation that the prophet is familiar with and is part of his own surroundings. He is trying to set something

forth to explain or to predict the fortunes, the experiences of his people. What will come to them. He is not dealing with the past, but trying to set forth some events that will take place and how this will all turn out, so I think that in the beginning of this Daniel is dealing primarily with the fortunes of the Jews back in the times prior to the coming of Christ.

I think we are a little bit short in this particular brethren, we have never given the study to that period between Malachi and Christ that we will have to give, and I think will be glad to give, some time. We little suspect the conflict between God's people and thenations because they were really bearing to the world the message until the Seed should come. In the struggle that was raging until the coming of this man that we have heard about, Antiochus Epiphanes, when his day set in it seemed a toss-up whether that man would succeed in Hellenizing the whole Jewish race and the whole people of God ~~when~~ would become heathenized by the tremendous pressure that was brought to bear upon that people. We have little idea of the awful conflict that the Jews passed through, and how God watched over them during that period, and how He saved them and the message that was finally given through Jesus Christ, the message to the whole world.

I certainly agree with what has been said here up to the 31st verse. I think that that description of Antiochus Epiphanes is very consistent with the history, but so far as I can see, the culmination of his attack on the Jewish people was not included. When that man took the city of Jerusalem and put his garrison in there, went into the sanctuary, stripped it of all of its holy instruments, took swine's broth and sprinkled over those sacred things,

left nothing that was not profaned, I don't think any part of that description prior to the 31st verse meets that account, and it seems to me that to the Jewish mind there could not be a stronger picture of who the antichrist was than the character and conduct of this man Antiochus Epiphanes.

Another thing. It seems to me that the interpretation we had fell short in not giving the 31st verse to =Antiochus Epiphanes. In the Maccabees, as I think was alluded to, there is an almost exact reproduction of the statement made in Daniel. It seems to me that to fail to bring that in there is to fail to come to the climax, considering the tremendous pressure that man brought to bear upon the Jewish nation. I think that this is an uninterpreted part of the prophecy. We find it so from the beginning to the 31st verse, but there we found, in following Brother Lacey in that splendid exposition, that he takes a leap of 200 years. That does not seem to me a natural thing.

G S LONGACRE: Isn't there a leap in the first few verses from Xerxes to Alexander the Great?

H C LACEY: Yes, sir.. Verse 2 is Xerxes, then immediately it says, "And a mighty king shall stand up." I conceive that it is similar in the 31st verse. I really had it in mind to bring in the 30th verse, "He shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do (exploits); he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant." And in the latter part you can put all of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes.

J N ANDERSON: That long break there it does not seem to me is a natural one. Not only because it is a break in the sense of

overleaping, but in a prophecy that is predicted, as this is, that moves along the line of human affairs, you have passed from Antiochus Epiphanes and you have also passed from the minor part of his life, omitting the larger part of his life, over to the Roman imperial empire in A. D. 70, and in doing so you have entirely ignored the coming of the Messiah, and I can't conceive how that could be so in a prophecy that seeks to give the fortunes of the Jewish people historically and chronologically. These are some of my difficulties, and I have relieved my system.

W W PRESCOTT: Do I understand that because the prophecy begins geographically, with definite countries located, the prophecy must continue on that line to the end?

J N ANDERSON: Unless you find some reason why he changes to apocalyptic prophecy.

W W PRESCOTT: Very good. Take the eighth of Daniel and here are three symbols presented. The first is interpreted to be the kings of Media and Persia, geographically located, but the other power is not so interpreted.

J N ANDERSON: Notice in this, too, there is no angel to explain this. The others are all explained later on.

W W PRESCOTT: The rest of the symbols are explained, but that doesn't prevent us from saying that the little horn represents both a country and a great spiritual principle, the papacy. Here it isn't the idea of geographical location. We apply that to the eighth chapter where the first two symbols are definitely located and named by name, and this brings up again the principle I spoke of before. Why are the two named and the third not named? Why in the seventh chapter are we able to take right out of scripture the in-

terpretation of the first symbol and name it, and the second symbol and name it, and the third symbol and name it, and the fourth kingdom isn't named? Why?

J N ANDERSON: Isn't it true that there are no nations named back there that hadn't already come into existence in Daniel's time?

W W PRESCOTT: I don't think so. This brings up that question that has been to me a very important question in the study of this whole line of prophecy, Daniel and Revelation and the whole language of the prophecy. Why does it never apply the name Rome to the fourth kingdom? Never. Why?

J N ANDERSON: Perhaps for the same reason John didn't name Rome when writing the Apocalypse, because he didn't dare.

W W PRESCOTT: I don't think John's daring prevented him at all.

F M WILCOX: Do you predicate the application of the king of the north in Daniel 11 to the papacy, on the geographical location?

W W PRESCOTT: No, I don't. But remember this, that I have had great difficulty in interpreting that prophecy and applying it to the papacy.

F M WILCOX: In the beginning of the chapter we located the king of the north and second the geographical ~~see~~ situation. Why not follow that in the final application?

W W PRESCOTT: In the eighth chapter we began the interpretation with pagan Rome. Why do we let in the papacy? In "Thoughts on Daniel" the papacy isn't let in. In "Thoughts on Daniel" the statement is repeated that both pagan and papal Rome are represented. But in the latter part of the eighth chapter the papacy

isn't bt in. I don't see any more difficulty in the 11th chapter than in the eighth over that question. There is a great significance to me in the fact that the kingdom is never called Rome.

M C WILCOX: God has a greater name for the papacy.

W W PRESCOTT: This whole question is a question of religion, really. Whether the religion of Jehovah shall prevail or whether the false idea of religion that the god of this world is ruling shall prevail. That question in the prophecy does not go through Media and Persia and Grecia. Babylon didn't go from ancient to modern through Media and Persia. Babylon religiously goes from ancient to Pergamos and then to the fourth kingdom, and that makes that fourth kingdom in the eyes of the prophecy, Babylon. That to me is the explanation of the whole thing, and when we lose sight of that we are in all sorts of danger a tangle. There is one main power in it all, and I must have that interpretation before I can see through it all. When I see that Babylon didn't come through Media and Persia, but from Pergamos, and constitutes the fourth kingdom in the eyes of the prophecy a Babylon, then it looks plainer.

J.L.SHAW: In the first verses of this chapter have you tried to make an application to Rome?

W.W.Prescott: O, no.

L.L.CAVINESS: How early in this 11th chapter does he find the papacy, the king of the north?

W.W.PRESCOTT: It is rather difficult for me. I am not without difficulties. I would rather have presented to you the reasons why I had to stop presenting the old view. I am studying over it. It is difficult for me to do the same thing in the 8th chapter. It is difficult for me to put my finger on the verse in the 8th chapter where you pass from political Rome to ecclesiastical Rome, because they are both used in the same way. When we come into Revelation we see it very clearly. In the 12th chapter there is the symbol of pagan Rome, and the symbol of the 13th chapter is papal Rome, with the seven heads and ten horns. There they are separated, and we can deal with them separately. When we come to the 8th chapter of Daniel it is difficult. They were both used for one purpose, and that was to shut out God.

W.G.WIRTH: I do not want to take too much time, but I really think, brethren, that our misconception, as I look at it, is due to the fact that ^{we think} this king of the north has to do with the geographical location. I think we get that misconception from the 13 4th verse of Daniel 11. We take that because it says it shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven. We think that must mean north, east, south and west.

A.G.DANIELLS: Tell us what it does mean, then.

W.G.WIRTH: I think it means universality, and emphasizes that thought rather than the thought of direction. I think the idea is

there that the whole world was in the hands of Alexander, and it was divided up into four parts, and because that empire was broken up into four fragments, that is why the prophecy says it was broken to the four winds. If you look at that from the viewpoint of Jeremiah, you will have to stretch our geography a bit to get east, west, north and south out of that.

Turn over to the 8th chapter of Daniel, and the 8th verse, where it speaks of the he-goat that waxed very great; and, when it was ~~xxxxxx~~ strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones, "toward the four winds of heaven." I do not think the emphasis there is to be placed on the four directions, -north, east, south and west; but the fact is that the kingdom finally resolved itself into four divisions.

Turn over to Matthew 24:31: "And they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." We have never said that that means exactly north, east, south and west. We have said that it means a general resurrection, a universal resurrection of the righteous.

Let us turn to Genesis 20:1. I think a little elucidation on that will open this question up. I will read the first verse from the Revised Version: "And Abraham journeyed from thence toward the ~~xxxxx~~ land of the South." The whole country south of Jerusalem was called "the land of the South."

Take Numbers 31:1: "And the ~~xxxxxxx~~ Canaanite, the king of Arad, who dwelt in the South, heard tell that Israel came by the way of Atharim; and he fought against Israel, and took some of them captive." That refers to south of Jerusalem. If the law of first mention holds here, and if this comprehensive view that Elder Prescott has brought out is worth anything, it seems to me we shall have

to take this into consideration.

Now in Jobhus 15:13-19 we have the same thing brought out in the tribes there. I will read the 19th verse, especially: "And she said, Give me a blessing; for thou hast set me in the land of the South, give me also springs of water." That expression, "the land of the South," is used continually for the country south of Jerusalem.

Judges 1:8, 9, brings in the same thought.

B. L. HOUSE: What is your point? One is just as much geographical as the other.

W.G.WIRTH: We think that Egypt has got to come in as king of the south.

B. L. HOUSE: When you started out you said you were opposed to the geographical idea.

W.G.WIRTH: I was referring to Alexander's empire. Subscribing to what Professor Prescott has brought out, I think there is a stronger meaning in it than that of mere direction. I think it means universality. The king of the south refers to any power south of Jerusalem, and the king of the north refers to those north of there, or, putting the spiritual application on it, any power that claims to sit "in the sides of the north," where God sits.

A.G.DANIELLS: Just a point here. Let us see if we can get back onto something simple and solid. When we talk about the second kingdom in this chapter, called Grecia, we have definite ideas as to location and territory, don't we? H

VOICES: Yes!

A.G.DANIELLS: We are certainly still here on that. Now, then, the prophecy says that that definite kingdom was to be divided into four parts. He carries us along a little farther, and he drops the

four parts and deals with two, doesn't he?

VOICES: Yes.

A.G.DANIELLS: He designates those two parts as north and south. The history that fulfills the prophecy sets forth the conflict between the two parts of Alexander's empire that became divided,-- deals with two parts in a great conflict, and names them, the Seleucid and the Ptolemaic or Egyptian. And the prophet says that one of those was the kingdom of the north and the other the kingdom of the south.

Now, what are we to say? Are we to say that Egypt was the kingdom of the north?

VOICE: Hardly.

A.G.DANIELLS: Now we are sure about some facts and some principles. Is that a fact or a principle?

VOICE: A fact.

A.G.DANIELLS: Is it a geographical fact?

VOICE: Yes.

A.G.DANIELLS: Is it a historical fact?

VOICE: Amen!

W.W.PRESCOTT: (Said something I did not understand about Babylon and Egypt.)

A.G.DANIELLS: I do not believe Egypt and Babylon have anything to do with it, so far as these prophecies are concerned. I do not think it is based on the ground of the principle that you brought out there with all those scriptures. I believe it is just a simple, plain, matter-of-fact statement that that literal kingdom of Alexander was divided into four parts, and then the prophet passed in his vision of it from the four parts to two, and the history does the same. It

seems to me we have to deal with that prophecy as it is given there in plain, literal language, and then we are put on solid ground as to those two kingdoms, the king of the north and the king of the south. And if I cannot understand that, then I do not know how to interpret or how to read the Bible or how to understand it. I have to take my stand right here, that Egypt was the kingdom of the south in that prophecy of Daniel 11. It was the southern part of the kingdom of Alexander. And I have to take my stand that the kingdom of Seleucus, what he gained in his conquests, what he wrested from the first generals that had it,--I have to believe that it is that territory that is represented geographically by the kingdom of the north. I cannot see the scripture that talks about Babylon as the north, or Lucifer the king of the north. I cannot see that it has anything to do with this simple prophecy. I do not wonder we get into difficulty in interpreting prophecy clothed in literal language when we try to pull in things that do not relate to it. It is a simple proposition that that territory in the eastern part of Alexander's empire that was taken by Seleucus, that territory in the northern part,--Asia Minor or ~~Sax~~ Syria,--taken by Lysimachus, and that part in Greece west of the Dardanelles, also passed into his hands. That is the territory of the king of the north, for the king of the north is not spoken of, ~~xxxx~~ and the territory is not referred to at all until after the division is made and two parts drop out of the prophet's view.

There is the starting point, ~~and~~ it seems to me, ~~xxxx~~ if we are going to follow these principles of interpretation that are laid down,--the law of first mention and the law of precise ~~xxxxxxx~~ meaning. Now, do I understand that the law of first mention ~~is going~~

would take us back to Genesis to some country that is called north, to be our guide in interpreting a prophecy presented in the 11th chapter of Daniel? Does it mean that?

H.C.LACEY: No, sir; certainly not.

W. T. KNOX: Wouldn't the law of first mention apply only in the prophecy itself?

A.G.DANIELLS: Yes, that is what has held me all the time. The first mention of the king of the south in that prophecy is Egypt. I consider that if I follow the law of first mention and the law of precise meaning in the interpretation of the prophecy, I must stick to that till I get through to the end of the prophecy.

T. E. BOWEN: Isn't it the prophet's real thought to trace down over the history of the nations to the fifth kingdom? Isn't that the objective, the standing up of Michael in the fifth kingdom?

A.G.DANIELLS: Yes. Now, brethren, I am unable to see why the 11th chapter applies any more to the 8th chapter of Daniel than it does to the 7th or the 2d. Take the 2d chapter of Daniel, and it brings you along to the division of the fourth kingdom, and stops. That is, it jumps from there to the fifth kingdom, the kingdom of Christ. You come to the 7th chapter, and it takes you beyond the division of the ten kingdoms to the rise of the little horn that continues for 1260 years. It is what we call "the supremacy," that period of time. That takes you beyond the 2d chapter, away down to the end of that period of time which I believe is 1798. There it leaps to the fifth kingdom, the kingdom of Christ.

DANIELS: Now then we come to the eighth chapter. That gives us all of the preceding two chapters down to that little horn that represents the ~~Expat~~ beginning of the Papal phase of Rome. That does not leave us there, but takes up another feature of the 2,300 ~~days~~ years and it carries us over the close of the 1260 year period down to the close of the 2,300 years to 1844.

How we come to the eleventh chapter ^{and} Daniel lays aside all the symbols and the figures and then takes up this history. He takes up this whole period that has been covered by the three previous chapters before, and gives us in literal language without symbols a history of the world from that kingdom that was ruling, -- Medo-Persia, down to the standing up of Michael.

Now the prophecy of the eleventh of Daniel does not stop with the eleventh chapter. The prophecy does not stop there; it goes on into the 12th chapter to the sixth or seventh verse as a prophecy, and there Daniel does something he didn't do in any other prophecy that he gave. He brought us to definite periods, the division of the fourth empire, the end of the 1260 years, the end of the 2300 years, and then the fifth kingdom. But now there is a period of time from 1844, the close of the 2300 year period, that he hasn't touched at all. He has leaped over that to the coming of Christ.

Now I have understood and believed that in this eleventh chapter, he undertakes to carry us along and give us a simple, plain statement of all this great period he has covered in other language, that we might read a statement and pin a historical fact to it just as the facts develop in the history

of the nations on down to the 1260 years where the Papacy is brought in the seventh chapter; and on down following the history of God's people to the 1844 period; and then he goes on and takes us over ground not covered in any other down to the standing up of Michael, and that part of it, I understand, is outlined in those verses from 40 to 45. Verses that give us the history of Turkey and Egypt from 1798 to the standing up of Michael; and not because those two powers are so mighty and so great, but because they occupy territory where centers the great controversy that will end the history of the world, where the last great battle of human conflict will be fought.

Now you must agree with me if you go to the 16th of Revelation, how the battle of Armageddon finishes the conflicts of the world, doesn't it? And why does the battle of Armageddon come there? It is because that is the stern cloud, that is the center of it all, and that is why those two powers are brought in, and not because one is sick or made up of a conglomeration of nations. They occupy territory that is most important, that is where the great controversy of all the ages will rage around, and the end will come ~~forth~~ and the great final battle will be fought there. It seems to me consistent; and so we are brought by the 11th chapter, as I understand it, to the very most important period of human history. It is the last days and events brought out so we may know surely where we are.

Now when it comes to the interpretation of those verses, I must say, brethren, that if I could take the history that has been given for the fulfillment of preceding verses, I

can certainly accept the history of Turkey and Egypt from Napoleon's ^{day} ~~time~~ down to the present time as meeting every specification and line in those verses from the 40th to the present time. I can because they are just as clearly fulfilled from the histories of Egypt and Turkey and we can read in those histories as definite a fulfillment of every line as Prof. Lacey read today in both his studies. You may say they do not answer, but they meet the points just as well as anything you read. All we have to do is to take those histories and read them. That is all, and I think we ought to do it. I do not believe that that period of time and the events that transpired in that conflict when Napoleon set out to take Constantinople;—that was his aim and that was one of the greatest projects of all modern times, one of the greatest projects ever attempted by any ruler in Europe, for if he had taken it, as far as we can see and as far as men and statesmen believed then and have ever since, he would have become the ruler of Europe and established a European monarchy. All these men have said, and nations have warred against each other with that in view, that the nation that ruled in Constantinople would rule the world. They knew Turkey was sick, and have given medicine to keep her sick and make her sicker and weaker.

A.O.TAIT: Has the power that ruled in Constantinople for the past three hundred years, I ruled the world?

DANIELLS: No, but I tell you there was a time when all the rulers of Europe trembled for fear that power would get control, and we know it. Now then they set their hands to break that power and to smash it, and they got the upper hand,

and in harmony with Divine ~~or~~ Providence too. They got the upper hand and kept that hand and kept administering that which would make that power sicker and weaker all the time. But that doesn't change the strategic value and meaning of the territory which the power occupies, and we know that for a hundred years, the British Empire has stood resolutely against Russia's getting Constantinople on the very ground that if Russia got it she would dominate the affairs of Europe. These facts we know well. I do not need to dwell on them.

Now some fear this great thing on now will break out in the Near East in that territory, that great highway between the East and the West, that bridge of continents. This thing will break out there, and the trouble is there. The trouble in this war just closed, if we can trust the best writers and scholars that have written upon it, such men as Dr. H. H. Powers, and many others. If we can trust these men with any judgment in political affairs, we will see that the war that has been on has not been about Western Europe, it has been about the East. It has been concerning Asia Minor. It has been over the strip of territory leading from Constantinople to the Persian Gulf. Great Britain has known why she has been in this thing very well, and she has known what would be the result to her empire if another European power besides Turkey got that strip of territory. It is not settled yet. The war is not over. They are afraid it will break out again over that very thing, and it will. That is where the controversy is coming. That is where the storm is going to break that will involve the world and bring Armageddon. My understanding is that Daniel had that fact revealed to him enough so that he

took up now all he had given us in previous chapters and just brought it down.

I don't know that Brother Anderson meant that Daniel and John ~~st~~ just studied the thing philosophically and fixed up the form in which they would present the Revelation, but I was afraid you did, because I don't believe that. I believe these men gave apocalyptic symbols when God revealed it to them, and gave plain facts in simple language without symbols when God gave it to them that way. And I believe that in that eleventh chapter Daniel was led by the Lord to give us a clear view of the history of the world from his day to the coming of Christ.

PRESCOTT: It strikes me as a queer thing, that Daniel 2 is symbolic, Daniel 7 is symbolic, and Daniel 8 is symbolic; yet we are agreed on all those. But when we come to a simple, straightforward statement of fact, in the eleventh chapter, we are all disagreed.

DANIELLS: I think that is because we are trying to lug in so much outside of the thing that doesn't belong there,-- trying to make it symbolic.

A G DANIELLS: I think if we would start, brethren, with a statement couched in literal language, it does seem as if we ought to understand it. I have made mistakes, and presume I am wrong in some views I have held. But I do want to get out right on this thing.

H C LACEY: I have in my hand William Miller's lectures. He had occasion to lecture on Daniel 11, and he applies the king of the north to Napoleon Bonaparte. He expatiates on the wonder of this prophecy and the accuracy of its fulfillment, so marvelously fulfilled in the time of Napoleon Bonaparte. We accepted that theory a little while after 1844, and as the years passed on it became necessary to revise it.

Before there was a real thorough study of that whole question, Uriah Smith, having the field, crystallized the presentation which we accept traditionally, and there is a psychological law there. If I have been trained in a thing and have had no question on it, and study it year after year simply to bring other extracts upon the line I have accepted a priori, it is more and more difficult for me to see anything else. There are manifest inaccuracies both philologically and historically in Brother Smith's book, and we are trying to get on to absolutely solid ground. It is a heavy thing, but it has seemed to me that we are perfectly solid right down to verse 39. That could be France, but it must be the papacy. Everything is hazy from that on. I don't say because we can take certain extracts which refer to France and Turkey and that fit these verses, that the aptness of the application necessarily proves that it down here, because when you get down to that time, you have adopted some inaccuracy. Little things here and there are

a

103

7/8

inaccurate. Our present application is no more necessarily true than the application of William Miller. The question is, what shall we put in its place?

W W PRESCOTT: Which is the accepted view now as to that scripture which says "tidings out of the east and north shall trouble him"?

A G DANIELLS: I think it began first not with any one battle or any one war. I believe it was the pressure that started in there against Turkey to reduce it to decay, as the Bible says. I believe it began in 1828 when Russia declared war just as Turkey had won her great conquests in Egypt as the prophecy pointed out, and had got to such a place of power again. Now then, to keep Turkey from sweeping on through North Africa, here came pressure from the North in 1828, and there began Turkey's downfall. I believe that these tidings out of the east and north as it has come upon Turkey from that day down to this war, has been a fulfillment of that statement.

W W PRESCOTT: Then my question is, Are we at liberty to differ from "Thoughts on Daniel" and still be regarded as sort of orthodox in presenting our view?

A G DANIELLS: First of all I ought to apologize for taking this time without permission. I would like to get there and stay there on that ground in the first few verses and then proceed. That is all I shall say now, but if there is time, and you brethren think it is profitable to do so, I would like to have historical data presented during the 100 years from Napoleon's time down to the present time regarding Egypt and Turkey. I would like to have somebody give what they believe, just like Brother Lacey. He took the

verse and brought in history. [To Lacey] Where you seemed to be so particular about the antecedents I noticed that back in the prophecy, to make it fit the history, you even made the translation wrong. Where the verse said the king of the south, you said it ought to be the king of the north. You challenged the reading, if you will remember. I noticed as you went along, and I think all must have noticed, that there is a great deal of liberty exercised in the reading, and that many a time the reading of the scripture was turned to fit the history. The liberty that is taken in the fore part of the chapter would not debar me very much when I come to the 40th verse from exercising a little liberty and just applying him to France.

I haven't made personally the study of the 36th to the 40th verses as Brother Spicer has. Some time ago, if you remember, when we were studying Daniel 8, Brother Prescott, you took one line, I another, and Brother Spicer another. He took it from 533 to 538 and dealt with the papacy along through the 1260 years. ~~Ixxxxxxx~~ I took from 503 to 508 and wrote nearly 100 pages of typewritten matter on that period. Brother Spicer worked a considerable time on the 533-538, and you handled 1793-1798. Now I stepped from that to the 40th verse, and while as you know I don't have so much time for research, yet I did put in as much time as I found it possible, on those last verses, and I tried to be faithful. I don't think there was a book in the Boston Library or the Congressional Library dealing with those two kingdoms from 1798 to the present time that I didn't get hold of and look over the very best I knew

how, so I feel freer to stand before this body on what I have given most study to, and I would rather begin with the 40th verse because that is a definite period. We all know that, because we see where all the men that have written on it, bring us down to the 40th verse and then they say that is unfulfilled and we don't know what is to come exactly, and we speculate on it. I don't. I feel just as clear about the last five verses of Daniel 11 as I do about the first 5 verses.

G B THOMPSON: The 1260 days are to be studied somewhere. Much depends on that.

A G DANIELLS: Personally I don't know, of course, what really one ought to do. I certainly don't, as chairman, want to press my view. I have been free to publish it. I have had men say in a very fearful way, that they were afraid to take such a stand, and I have had others ask me, "Suppose that never happens, then what will happen to you?" I say I don't know, that's what I believe. "I have believed, therefore have I spoken." Somebody said the other day, "Now Great Britain has given Palestine to the Jews. Suppose the Lord comes and the Turk doesn't get there?" Well, I hope to get to heaven even if the Turk don't get to Jerusalem, and I reason that I won't be much more surprised than the one who looks to see the pope get there.

A C TAIT: Can I say a word?

A G DANIELLS: No, you can't. I was going to say, I have been free to speak on this because I have believed it to the roots of my hair. I don't believe that I believe it because it was put in Daniel and Revelation." I don't believe that view of the Daily that is put in there at all. Brother Prescott began to open up that

question to me way back 19 years ago, and I hesitated, but I kept looking and looking, and the facts convinced me. I accepted it, and I took my stand openly and freely, and I stand with all my weight on that new view of the daily. I read it right through the chapter too, the Revised Version.

(A.G. Daniells, continued)

The thing that swung me was the chapter itself; so I do not think I hold the view of the king of the north or the eastern question, as we call it, because it is written in "Daniel and the Revelation." I believe I hold it on other ground; but I am not ashamed of "Daniel and the Revelation" nor the writer. [Voices: NO!] I have no derogatory word to speak of that great and good man who wrote that book. God will cover his mistakes just as He did William Miller's mistake. And He will cover my mistakes if I am wrong on the king of the north, because He knows I have been honest. I have not gone in and written on it or preached on it to maintain a tottering theory,--nothing of the kind. I studied it carefully, and I believed I had a right to proclaim it, for it was not destructive of what we had been teaching and holding as a people. It was not new, and I certainly had a right to enunciate views that we had been holding all our denominational history. That is quite different from springing some new thing on the denomination that we have not had, so I felt free to do it.

I believed it when I wrote it, and I must say I believe it more firmly ~~xxxx~~ this minute than when I wrote on it in the Review. I must say that the study of this thing so far has clinched this view in my mind. And I believe when it is all written up and when the atmosphere clears, and we get hold of the tangible, we will find ourselves on this ground.

Now, it is not my right to press my view any more than any other one here, and so I shall not speak on it any further, so far as I can see now, unless it might be thought best for me to give my understanding of the fulfillment of these last verses from 40-45 from the standpoint of history.

W.F.PRESCOTT: I move that it is the sense of the convention that Brother Danie lls should take the time to present such portions of this question as he feels free to present. If someone feels free to deal with verses 36-40, I would like it.

The motion was seconded.

E. R. PALMER: I have very much wished that the whole case on the other side might come in before we take up this from your point of view. The Review and Herald Book Committee during all this time of question has stood together, I think, to a man, on the old position. Brother Spicer has written upon it in the little books, and you [speaking to Elder Daniella] have, and we have published it in "Bible Readings," "Our Day," and in Present Truth. It has been going out widely, and has seemed to meet with a good deal of favor in the field. But many questions are being asked concerning it, and questions are being asked in our committee, and I wish we might have the whole case before us, as Brother Wilcox and others might present it, and then have a rounding up of the whole thing. I feel as though, as a the Review and Herald office, we have to stand on the old position until something better is found,--that we should stand on it and publish it.

My feelings might perhaps be illustrated by the vote taken by the early settlers in Connecticut. Before they left their ship in early winter, and were going to be crowded for time to make houses and laws, they got together and voted that the settlement would be guided by the ten commandments until they had time to meet and form something better. [Laughter] That is on record as their action among the first laws of Connecticut.

I think we should stand on this proposition until something

better is presented. I would like to hear all sides of the question. They are very interesting to me. Not to shut out this proposition for the chairman to take the floor, but I would like to hear what we have called the new view discussed further first. Brother Wilcox would like to speak for twenty minutes. Brother Tait has a little different view, but he would like to speak a few minutes. I would like to see all these ideas come in, and then have the chairman present the matter from his viewpoint.

C. M. SORENSON: I misjudged the audience, evidently. I did not know that the new view was so widespread. I merely touched a few outstanding points of the view which we had taught for many years. I could have given a verse-by-verse study, and brought in many historical extracts, but I thought it was the other side that needed the extracts. I am very glad the chairman will bring these matters to us, though personally I feel perfectly clear on the question.

A. G. DANIELLS: I think we should give Brother Wilcox the opportunity he desires to present his views, for I suppose he is more responsible than any other man in America for this controversy that we have here, and certainly he is entitled to state his view just as clearly as possible, and bring forth all the proof that he has for it, and I would prefer to have that given now right in connection with what Professor Lacey has presented. So, while I appreciate this motion that has been made, and the evident willingness for me to say something, I think it would be better for Brother Wilcox to present that side, and have all there is of it. The only way we can judge properly is for all the evidence to be presented. If the evidence is not all in, the part that is left out may be the part that would convince us, or that would settle the thing; so I would be glad to extend a request to Brother Wilcox to take it up tomorrow morning at the second period. [It was so voted.]