

## CHRIST THE MASTER-TEACHER, WE THE UNDERTEACHERS

W. E. HOWELL.

July 24, 1915, 8:15

Christ is the Master-Teacher, and we are the underteachers,-- under the discipline of Christ, under the tuition of Christ, revealers of Christ to those who do not know Him. Christ was the Master-Teacher. He taught as He was, and He was what He taught. That is what gave Him that great power, that great authority in His teaching, that amazing result upon the people when they gave Him the honor of teaching and speaking as never any man spoke before.

We, the underteachers, sent by Him to continue His work, may become Masters of our profession, as we are exhorted to be, only on the same basis of being and living what we teach. Being underteachers to Christ, we teach Christ. We teach Christ effectively only as we live Christ. Only in that sense can we carry on the work He left us to complete.

As Christ was sent by the Father into the world to be the Master-Teacher He was, so He has sent us into the world to be under-teachers to Him, to be vessels unto the honor of His name, vessels ~~xxxxxx~~ in which the Spirit may dwell and do His work, we to be meet for the Master's use wherever and however He ~~xxxxxx~~ sees fit to place us, we to be constantly prepared, always improving in preparation unto every good work.

In the wonderful prayer of the Master-Teacher in John 17, I want to notice a few verses this morning bearing upon this sending of us. From these short studies I think it is clear to us that if we have any calling at all to do the work in which we are engaged, it is a divine calling; and if a divine calling, then we want to

know all we can about what that calling comprehends. In the 18th verse of John 17, we are told not only how we are sent, and by whom, but where:

"As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world."

There was great risk in that, wasn't there; for Christ to send us into the world, that very world that needs salvation, that very world that is exhibiting to all the universe the heinousness of sin in all its variations and manifestations? What wonderful confidence the Master-Teacher imposes in you and me to trust us with such a mission as that, in such a place as that!

Now verse 19: "And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth."

What is it that is to keep us on this perilous mission?--It is that constant indwelling of the truth, that constant sanctification, being set apart, kept apart by the purity of the truth by which we live and which we endeavor to teach,--sanctified through the truth.

In the 14th verse, lest there might be some misapprehension of His expression that He has sent us into the world, He says this: "I have given them thy word,"--for what purpose?--First, to live by, to make it the Man of our counsel, our daily food and drink; second, that we may minister that word and make it to others what it has become to us.

"I have given them thy word." It is that word of truth that is our shield and our buckler, our constant strength and our efficiency in all that He has sent us to do. "I have given them thy <sup>world</sup> ~~word~~, and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the ~~world~~ world, even as I am not of the world." We are sent into

the world, but we are not to be of the world while we are in the world doing the work He has given us to do.

The 15th verse is a prayer,--not the one He prayed back there in Palestine on this memorable occasion, but it is in the present tense,--"I pray." We might render it, "I am praying." His attitude never changes. So, as our Mediator, our Intercessor, our Master-Teacher, this morning He is still praying this prayer: "I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil,"--the evil that is in the world. We are sent into the world, but are not to be of the world,--sent into an evil world, but kept from the evil that is in the world.

I want to read a few lines from "Education," page 46; bearing upon the thought of what the under-teacher is to be. Speaking of the founding of the schools of the prophets, it says this:

"From the earliest times, prophets had been recognized as teachers divinely appointed. In the highest sense the prophet was one who spoke by direct ~~xxxx~~ inspiration, communicating to the people the messages he had received from God." [This is the second of the major gifts enumerated by Paul,--that of the prophet directly inspired, communicating special messages from God for the welfare of His people.] But the name was given also to those who, though not so directly inspired, were divinely called to instruct the people in the works and ways of God."

Notice the call, <sup>the</sup> a prophet divinely ~~appointed~~ appointed, a special type of teacher, and others divinely called to instruct in the word and the ways of God.

A little further down the page it says something of <sup>what</sup> these instructors, divinely called, are to be, and were then: "The instruc-

tors were not only versed in divine truth, but had themselves enjoyed communion with God, and had received the special endowment of His Spirit."

There is the spiritual gift, a special endowment to teach. To teach what?--O, to teach the ~~word~~<sup>works</sup> and the ways of God.

"They had the respect and confidence of the people, both for learning and for piety."

Note the combination, ~~xxxxxx~~ "both for learning and for piety." Those were the two outstanding characteristics of those teachers especially endowed of God to teach His word and His ways. These few words set out very clearly, it seems to me, the real interpretation of the prayer of christ for us.

You will notice in this brief reading three things are mentioned. that are to be the special burden and mission of the teacher to teach: First the word, and second the works, and third the ways of God. In other places ways is expressed as the providences of God. Whichever way we say it, it means the same. Those three w's are set out as the sacred objective of the teacher.

You will recall that it was back when Israel was tempted, in the days of Samuel, that the schools of the prophets were founded, the first separate case of schools recorded in history, I think I am correct in saying. The young people then were tempted to go after the ways of the world. They learned the ways of the heathen, and were attracted away from the word and works and ways of God. It was to bring them back and put barriers of safety around them that that first school was brought into existence. It is said of the nation as a whole, in the time of Samuel, that they had gone so far in their intercourse with the nations about them, and had so imbibed the spirit of the world that they conceived the idea of being organ-

ized as a nation, like the nations around them; and so they asked for a king. Samuel took it to heart seriously, and felt that he was rejected by the people in his high and holy office; and he went to the Lord about it, and the Lord said to Samuel, Just calm yourself about that. They have not rejected you, they have rejected Me.

Those teachers were divinely appointed to instruct the people and lead them away from that desire for a king, and bring them back to be willing to be led of God in His own good way.

God would have His people in the world, not of the world. What a high and holy calling He has placed on you and me, and how careful we should be to safeguard that trust and keep our mission distinct and clear before our eyes, without any of the elements of the world in it, but teaching a pure gospel for the pure purpose for which He has called us, or, in other words, as we are so earnestly exhorted, in come out and be separate from the world as teachers and as schools, as an organized body, and set before us that one goal of teaching the truth and living the truth and bringing the truth to those who do not know it. Surely, the uppermost longing of heart and soul of every one of us this morning is to be true to that divine calling!

H. C. Lacey

July 24, 1919, 10:15

I think before passing directly to the specific theme suggested one or two words of introduction are necessary. I would like to state quite simply and straight-forwardly two convictions I have with reference to college Bible study:

First, it should be the strongest department in the college, intellectually.

Of course the spiritual side should be all-pervasive. I thoroughly believe that. It has been emphasized here at the conference. But I take it that in connection with the college department of any of our institutions, the danger is not so much that the work will not be spiritual as that it will not measure up in comparison with the other work of the college, intellectually. The real, practical difficulty is not the spiritual side. For instance, we have all felt for a number of years that there has been a lack in the Bible teaching, not on the spiritual side, but that the work has not measured up to the other studies intellectually. What we want to do is to strengthen them intellectually. I want to read to you two or three extracts from "Christian Education," pages ~~104-105~~ 104-105. I have the old edition. Here in the article entitled ~~the book of books~~ "The Book of Books," I read the following:

"The study of the Bible will give strength to the intellect. Says the psalmist, 'The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple.' The question has often been asked me, 'Should the Bible become the important book in our schools?' It is a precious book, a wonderful book. It is a treasury containing jewels of precious value. It is a history that opens to us the

past centuries. Without the Bible we should have been left to conjectures and fables in regard to the occurrences of past ages. Of all the books that have flooded the world, be they ever so valuable, the Bible is the Book of books, and is most deserving of the closest study and attention."

It is not a passive, devotional reading that is mentioned, although I would not discount that for a moment; it is not that attitude of the heart towards it which is a receptive one, to listen to what the Spirit of God may say, for that is presupposed; but when we come to the college Bible ~~xxxxxx~~ classes, the character of the work conducted is to be an active, vigorous, penetrating study into God's truths as revealed in the Bible, under the guidance of the Spirit of God.

Then on page 106 is this: "It unfolds a simple and complete system of theology and philosophy."

You notice from that statement that there is a simple, complete system of theology and philosophy. I am sure we should miss the mind of God if we should take the instruction that has come to us recently and discount vigorous, earnest, penetrating study of the Bible intellectually. I emphasize this because the other side has been so strongly emphasized.

Farther down I find this: "If the study of the Scriptures is made a secondary consideration, great loss is sustained."

So it seems to me that the Bible should take the first place, and the students should ~~give~~ be given work so that they will have to study as hard as they would in the geometry class in seeking to solve geometrical problems, or in the language class in translating the thought from one tongue into another, or in the science class, or any other study that we can mention.

with  
"The understanding takes the level of the things, which it becomes familiar. If all would make the Bible their study, we should see a people further developed, capable of thinking more deeply, and showing a greater degree of intelligence, than the most earnest efforts in studying merely the sciences and histories of the world could make them. The Bible gives the true seeker [I want you to notice the active nature of these words; you know our devotional study is a passive study, but there is an active study, where we seek and search and dig] an advanced mental discipline, and he comes from contemplation of divine things with his faculties enriched; self is humbled, while God and his revealed truth are exalted. It is because men are <sup>un</sup>acquainted with the precious Bible histories, that there is so much lifting up of man, and so little honor given to God. The Bible contains just that quality of food that the Christian needs in order that he may grow strong in spirit and intellect."

Now, there is no discounting the intellectual benefit that may be derived from the study of the Bible. While the college Bible studies should be spiritual, they should ~~maximize~~ do strong intellectual work, for the Bible class is not a prayer meeting, or a revival service,--and above all, it is not a preaching service, or ought not to be. There may be times when it might well be turned into a revival service, but that should not be the regular thing.

But let me repeat that last sentence I read, and add another one to it: "The Bible contains just that quality of food that the Christian needs in order that he may grow strong in spirit and intellect. The searching of all books of philosophy and science cannot do for the mind and morals what the Bible can do, if it is studied and practiced."



In my hasty review of some of these sentiments, I came across this one in "Education," page 124:

"As a means of intellectual training, the Bible is more effective than any other book [now here is a peculiar statement], or all other books combined. [That is a tremendous statement, brethren. Are we ready to accept it? And if we do accept it, where shall we get the exercises which will realize this experience? If that is not obtained in the College Bible classes, where will it be obtained?] The greatness of its themes, the dignified simplicity of its utterances, the beauty of its imagery, quicken and uplift the thoughts as ~~a~~ nothing else can. No other study can impart such mental power as does the effort to grasp the stupendous truths of revelation. The mind thus brought in contact with the thoughts of the infinite can not but expand and strengthen."

Mathematics and science will pale into insignificance as a factor in developing mental culture when the Bible is studied as it should be studied, when the spirit is not merely one of submission, of listening to the word, but of endeavor to dig beneath the surface and bring to the surface the hidden wealth which is there.

W. E. HOWELL: Don't you think that our lack along the line you are emphasizing at this point tends to drive us toward other kinds of mental ~~an~~ pursuits for mental development rather than depending more upon this?

H. C. LACEY: Yes, I think that if the classes are not conducted with this thought in mind, to strengthen the students intellectually as well as spiritually, the students will get their training elsewhere, or if they do come, it will be because they have to.

W. E. HOWELL: Possibly the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Bible teachers have been made to feel that the student gets his mental

training in other departments.

H. C. LACEY: I think we ought to make it the strongest department, intellectually. The emphasis has been so much upon the other that I want to emphasize this. I am sure that a cold, intellectual study of the Bible is an absolute mistake; but I am equally convinced that a warm, spiritual skimming over the surface of the Bible is not sufficient. The desideratum is a spirit-filled, deep, searching study of the Bible, combining both.

The spiritual element should be all-pervasive in our Bible study. I do not want to omit that. I think our Bible classes ought to open with prayer, and ought to continue in a spirit of prayer and of dependence on the leading of the Spirit of God.

Then I think we ought to be careful not to displace the spirit of active, penetrating study, or what Sister White calls "digging," by that of a passive, devotional attitude.

I feel impelled to give you a little instance. In a school with which I became connected, I had a rather hard time the first year because a large number of questions were thrown upon me. We had a good time in many ways, but when these questions were thrown onto me, I, in my simplicity, faced them all and answered them, not trying to hide anything. There was no bluffing. I cannot bluff. I hate it and hate to see it in others. I had this confidence in the third angel's message, that it is capable of meeting anything and everything, not in the spirit of bravado, but that this is the truth. I believe the Bible is the word of God, and I believe this message is the final message to our world at this time. It is sound, and I do not think there is any feature of it that needs to hide itself and be afraid to come out in the light. That is my heart attitude to it all the while. Somewhere I read this, that we

ought to study with the telescope and the ~~microscope~~ microscope everything everywhere. It is all open to the Christian who will study on his knees with the open Bible.

That is my feeling in the matter, that the Spirit should be one of dependence on God, on his ~~knees~~ knees, with the Bible before him, as the guide, and then let him look into the skies, into the infinitely small as well as the infinitely great.

They threw hosts of question onto me, and I answered them, and we had trouble. Things came out, and they were a little ~~different~~ different from what they supposed, - some of these things about the Testimonies, for instance, that Elder Daniells and Brother Robinson told us. I had been, in a measure, connected with some of these things, and I knew certain things. But I have not lost confidence in the Testimonies. While I believe them, I cannot take the attitude that some take who do not know the facts. Perhaps it was unwise for me to make some of those statements, but they had never been hidden in the community where I had just come from.

About three years afterwards one of our brethren, who is now president of one of our colleges, came to me and said, "Brother Lacey, I have thought often of telling you this. It is due to you under the Lord, that I am still in the truth. Do you remember the questions I used to fire at you in the college in Daniel and the Revelation class? "

I said I remembered them very well. He was rather critical.

"Well," he said, "the year previous I was puzzled over a great many of these things, and in the Bible class I used to ask similar questions. We loved our teacher, but this was his attitude. Instead of answering, he would say, "We are getting into deep water.

Let us pray.' So they would get down and consume the rest of the time in a prayer-meeting. You may think I am an infidel," he said, "but that thing hardened me. It occurred a number of times. But when you came, you showed a different spirit,--that of 'Come on in, boys, the water is fine.'"

I am not saying this to make any contrast, but to suggest this point, that I do not think we ought to try to hide things. We ought to face things. We may have to change our attitude toward some points, as I am sure some of you will do about the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies, if you will open your eyes and see what are the facts with reference to the case. I think we ought to face truth rather than to try to hide it, and especially to hide under an appearance of spirituality. That did not help that boy. But the next year, despite all the heartaches we had over the new things that appeared, that boy was established in the truth, and he is one of our strongest workers.

My point is this: I do think we ought to be careful not to displace the spirit of active, penetrating study and inquiry, not to try to cover it up and crowd it out by that of a passive spirituality or devotion. I do not think the College Bible class ought to be placed where we hide our head in the sand and refuse to look at things. There might be cases where the class could profitably be turned into a testimony meeting or a prayer meeting. I would not suggest anything against that; but the college Bible class is for study.

Here is the second point I would like to make before we study the scope and content directly. The Bible teacher, it seems to me, should be the most thoroughly qualified, the most highly educated man on the faculty. Instead of selecting just any one, because he is

a good man and a good preacher and a good field man,--while that all ought to come into it,--the college Bible teacher should be the most highly qualified man on the faculty. He should be a thoroughly experienced man. He should be a student, with the spirit of a student, and he should be a student of the word of God in the original tongues. I expect a good many will oppose me in that, but this is the way I feel about it. I did not say a master of the original tongues, but a student of them. If the Spirit of God has seen fit to give us the Scriptures in those sacred tongues, then we are going contrary to His providences when we absolutely ignore them, and refuse to take the time and expend the effort necessary to get down to the embodiment of the thought of God as He originally gave it.

It looks to me something like this: The Bible says we are ambassadors for God. What would you think of an ambassador from the United States going to China with a message upon which the life and fortunes and liberties of the Chinese depended, and then that ambassador, entrusted with such a message, having in his hands only a translation of this document from the United States in Chinese, translated by others, and never taking the trouble himself to find out what the government over here really said? Wouldn't you say he was not true to his name? The providence of God has seen fit to give us His thoughts in Hebrew and Greek, and you and I want to find out why, and the Bible teacher ought to. As he leads his students into a mutual study of the word of God, He should be able to tell them what the thoughts of God are in their original purity. I cannot get away from this. I wonder how ~~God~~ feels when any disparagement is cast upon the study of ~~the~~ His thoughts as He originally gave them.

I think he should not only be a sympathetic student of the thoughts of God as they were originally enunciated in the Scriptures, but he should be an open-minded student of history and science. In "Christ's Object Lessons," pages 125 and 126, this statement is made: "The great storehouse of truth is the word of God,"--What is meant by that? There is a dash, and then occurs this sentence: "The written word, the book of nature, and the book of experience in God's dealing with human life." The Bible is only one-third of the word of God. The great storehouse of truth is the word of God, first the written word, then the book of nature, then the book of experiences, --what we call his word, then his works, then his ways, as someone expressed it yesterday.

Can the student of the Bible effectually study the Bible who will neglect science and neglect history? I hold that he cannot. I think the Bible teacher in our colleges should be a man who knows something about science and something about history. He should be a good scientist, so far as opportunity has been afforded him, and his sympathy should be that way. He should be an open-minded, candid student of the Bible, getting all the light he can from science and history, and realizing that he is teaching only one-third of the word of God. A narrow-minded man who will confine himself to the written word will be an ineffective college Bible teacher.

I think, further, that he ought to be a skillful master in the use of the English tongue. This is one of the things that we should not neglect, for when our students go out they must know how to express their thoughts.

Now let us come to the point directly. What is the aim of the college Bible studies? I would like to put down as primary this:

It is to know God as our Father and His Son Jesus Christ as our

personal Saviour. That is the fundamental, all-pervasive purpose of all our Bible study. I simply do not emphasize that here, for we all recognize it and hold it always there.

Second, to become intelligently familiar with the great truths of revelation that reveal Him. I think that is the aim. I think we ought to study all the--I am going to use that discredited word--all the Doctrines of the Bible.

I think we ought to start here what we will continue all through eternity, perhaps in a different way. We shall study the thoughts of God. The classes of the hereafter will not be revival classes, will they? It will be an earnest, penetrating study ~~ings~~ into the essentials of the plan of salvation, and the works of God, and the main thing will not be revival. I do not think it is now,--perhaps not as much as it ought to be.

There are numerous doctrines or truths to be studied. I think the great purpose is that we should become intelligently familiar with them. I want to use an illustration which I think will help us to get this whole thing before us. Take the study of astronomy. The great purpose of that is to get familiar with the stars; but we have to use a means by which we can do that, and we use the telescope. Now, brethren, a dear old man from the farm can get behind the eye-piece of the telescope and look up at the moon or Sirius, and if his eyesight is as good, he will see ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ just the same shades of light that the advanced astronomer sees, but does he see as much? [VOICES: No!] What I want to say is this: That is just a passive experience. The light comes down from Sirius into the eye of the uneducated man as well as into the eye of the educated man, and they both get the same impressions; but

the educated man, the astronomer, who has studied these things from various viewpoints, sees much more in it. He sees the same thing that the uneducated man sees, but much more, because he has studied mathematics, physics, and light. This Bible is a telescope through which we are to see God, and you can put this Bible in the hands of any one, an uneducated person, and if he will look through it he can see God just as much as the most highly trained Bible student or teacher can see him in one sense, as a passive recipient of light and truth; but does he see as much?--No! The one is trained in Bible study, and knows how to use the Bible, and sees much more in the same words.

My point is that the college Bible class should provide that intellectual training which is analogous to the astronomer who looks through the telescope and the spectroscope. <sup>training which the</sup> Where shall we get that intellectual training? I looked for this sentence in the spirit of prophecy, but could not find it. In one of these books Sister White says that God is best ~~maximized~~ glorified by those who serve him intelligently. Isn't He much more glorified by the Christian astronomer who looks through the telescope and the spectroscope than by the unintelligent Christian?

Now as to the scope and content of these: I have jotted down what I conceive to be the studies that we should pursue in the college department.

First, advanced doctrines. I am not sure but what advanced doctrines ~~ought~~ ought to come last, and yet so many students can not take the entire course of four years that we give it in the first year. There are many reasons why it should be last. In fact, almost any of these subjects could be put last.



I think this Advanced Bible Doctrines class should be a strong, critical, thorough study of the fundamental doctrines and truths of the Bible. I think it would be well to begin with studying the principles of Bible study. I have always done that. We would emphasize first of all the absolute fact that the mind is not the final recipient of the truths of God, that the heart is. The Bible tells us that. But we are to use our minds, and are to receive into the heart the truths.

Second, I think the <sup>next</sup> most important topic of Bible study should be the inspiration of the Bible. This is God's peculiar word to us. I find there is a very peculiar, hazy conception in the minds of our students on this question. You will find not only that the students will be helped by this, but they will be mightily interested in it. The word of God is different from anything else. It is different from the Testimonies. It is verbally inspired, and the Testimonies are not, and do not claim to be, but the Bible does.

Next, such truths as the Godhead. We have been studying that here as teachers and ministers, and yet it is a truth revealed in the Bible, one of the things we are searching, and shall search all through eternity.

Then the divinity of Christ, and the personality of the Holy Ghost,--I think these should be included in the scope of such a study. The sanctuary question and the spirit of prophecy <sup>should be</sup> considered, and we should fearlessly face objections which students ~~face~~ from their experience in the field have met in their work, and try to answer them, and humbly recognize the fact that quite often there is more light along that line.

The next class would be Daniel and Revelation. I know some give both Daniel and Revelation and Advanced Bible Doctrines in the

same year; but it seems to me that is endeavoring to cover too much. Advanced Bible Doctrines is one full year, and Daniel and Revelation is another full year in Union College. Our present truth is largely based on those two books, Daniel and the Revelation, and we ought to have a real critical, penetrating, spiritual study of those books verse by verse. I believe all that has been said here about the necessity of our getting that great main line of <sup>the</sup> establishing of the kingdom of God, but that ought not to prevent a thorough study of each detail as presented in those books. If the Lord has given us those books, we ought to examine them carefully.

What shall we do when we are face to face with different views in Daniel and Revelation? Students know some of these things. They are not virgin minds, that have no idea about these questions; if they were, we could be dogmatic, as in teaching in a tent. But students have inquiring minds. I think we should tell them the present denominational position. Daniel 11 is the biggest thing among us at the present time, and I should say, teach them the old view, which is the one the majority of our people believe; but if you feel that there is a sufficient demand for the new view, I would give them that, in a private way. The first year I did a little different from that, I told them the old view, and then spent a week on the new one, and I think they saw light in the new one. After a year or so had gone by I found there was trouble out in the field.

So the next year I took them through the old view, and I managed it so that we reached the end of the first semester <sup>without</sup> at the ~~close~~ <sup>close</sup> of the book of Daniel, and we began Revelation with the next semester, not touching the new view at all. But Elder Underwood came to me, and he said the students wanted the ~~other~~ <sup>new</sup> view. I finally said to the older students, You have got your money's worth,

and if you want to take this special work, I am going to charge you for it. I thought that would cut half of them out, but they wanted that new view.

What should be our attitude toward it? I would take the denominational view, and present it, and hold the other in abeyance; and if there are advanced students who could be trusted, who would say if they mentioned it, This is what some are thinking is the meaning of Daniel 11, but it has not been decided yet, I would give it to them.

As to the method of teaching Daniel and Revelation, it seems to me that under the present circumstances, the only method is the lecture method. That is that the teacher must give the results of his study, at the same time requiring some original research and a thesis, and the regular examinations. But necessarily we are going beyond what is said in "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation." It is a college study, and they have had that in the twelfth grade.

The next line of study is the epistles, or major and minor prophets. It seems to me the epistles should be studied. ~~xxx~~ They are letters written by the Spirit of God to the churches, and they are for instruction. They arose out of certain conditions in those days, but they contain instruction of perennial value. I think they ought to be studied in chronological instead of canonical order. The chronological order of the epistles is a beautiful order: First comes 1st and 2d Thessalonians; then a gap of about five years; then Galatians, Romans, and Corinthians; another gap of about five years, and then Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon; a gap of about five years, and then Timothy and Titus, and coming about that time, James and Hebrews, and then, <sup>1st,</sup> 2d and 3d John. Peter and James are a little indeterminate. There are 21 epistles to be studied, and it

seems to me they ought to be taken in their chronological order/first. There is a beautiful unfolding of truth when we do that. Then I think we ought to study the historical background very carefully from Sister White's books and others. You know some of the men who have immersed themselves in the collateral history of those times, and what light they can give us. Then a study of the epistles themselves in an effort to get the distinctive theme of each.

I think good outlines ought to be developed; and there is excellent mental training in the effort to get symmetrical and artistic outlines. It is very easy to read the epistles through and ~~cut~~ <sup>mark</sup> a thing out here and there, but one should try to get a good grasp of the whole thing, by reading it through and through and through many times, and then getting a comprehensive, symmetrical outline. The word of God is worthy of our best intellectual effort.

When Matthew was giving us the genealogy of Christ, he said there were fourteen generations from Abraham to David, fourteen generations from David to the carrying away into Babylon, and fourteen generations from that time to Christ. But he was very careful how he stated it: "All the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen," and that is absolutely true; "and from David until the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations," but he left out three; "and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations," but there he overlapped. If he could do that, then you and I can take an outline and beautify and adorn it so that men can take it and hold it.

J. N. ANDERSON: But we should be careful how we follow Matthew in that.

H. C. LACEY: Yes, that is so; but there is a very mysterious union between the human and the divine. When God spoke through Paul,

the word had Paul's impress upon it. When I sit down to the piano and play "The Messiah," you will hear the piano in the music; when I sit down to the organ and play "The Messiah," you will hear the organ, yet the inspiring power is there in both organ and piano. The human puts its impress upon the divine. If Matthew could do that, I can do it, speaking humbly. We can present outlines which are helpful and symmetrical and beautiful.

I believe in committing a good deal to memory. Long ago everybody committed things to memory, but now we have gone to the other extreme, and you can scarcely find anyone who can quote a text correctly. Many have lost the ability to commit ~~things~~ texts to memory.

Major and minor prop\_hets should, I believe, follow in much the same way. Get the historical background, study each message, and then pick out the eternal principles that apply to our own day.

In neither of these studies have we text-books that we would feel like using. Have the students do independent research work in a good library.

There is one other line which appeals very greatly to me, and that is the study of the Testimonies and wisdom literature of the Bible. I have given a special course in the study of the Testimonies, taking the order of events in the rise of the great controversy at the beginning of this world's history, and then the order of events from 1844 on, taking "Early Writings" and "Great Controversy" as the basis, and bringing the Bible in to support those statements. I have found the very deepest interest on the part of our people in these studies. There is a semester's work in this.

That is followed by the wisdom literature of the Bible. Take

Job, for instance. That is a marvelous argument on the problem of pain, and the last word is said that human reasoning can offer, and there is a dramatic closing. A college class ought to get some of that. Brother Daniells said here at the <sup>beginning of the</sup> Conference that the Bible study ought to be made fascinating, --He did not say spiritual, --it ought to be made fascinating, so that our students would feel like dropping their lighter literature and taking something along this line.

The Psalms should be taken the same way, arranged chronologically. We begin with the first Psalm, but David didn't write that, you know. He wrote 74 of them. Take David's first Psalm, when he kills Goliath, the 9th Psalm. There is real intellectual food in the Psalms, and also in the Proverbs.

Then take Ecclesiastes, the great book on the highest good. That is a finished discussion on the great end of life. What is the one thing that I shall do here under the sun? Solomon tells us that he had tried everything. He tried physical pleasures, he tried intellectual pleasures; but he says, ~~the~~ "Hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole ~~sum of~~ of man." Our translators have supplied the word duty there, and spoiled the whole thing. He says these other things do not satisfy; "Fear God, and keep his commandments, and that is the rounded whole of man."

Then take the "Song of songs," the same way. That is a fascinating love story. <sup>which is translated as a love story</sup> I do not think those ought to be left out of a college course in Bible.

Finally we have the ancestry of the Bible. Three months is not necessary for that.

Then there are some historical books of the Bible that have not

been touched. The reading and outlining of these makes a most valuable study.

In such a course the whole Bible is covered.

J. N. ANDERSON: I think the four gospels, dealing with the life of Christ, should have as prominent a place as the epistles.

H. G. LACEY: Yes, that is excellent.

W. E. HOWELL: I want to second this last suggestion. I have felt the last two or three years particularly that we should have a college course on the teachings of Jesus. We leave those away down in the ninth grade, and there it is much interwoven with the story of His life, the succession of events, and all that. The study of the teachings themselves must be more or less superficial in an elementary class of students. We take our students through and graduate them without any further deep study of the teachings of Jesus, around which essentially the whole Bible turns. I would rather see almost any one of these latter subjects left out if that is necessary, than to have this left out.

----oOo----