



3 3433 11601 2067

R RACE

NEWS-LEAFLET



"The King's business requires haste."

No. XL.

Fourth Set. 1.

SEPTEMBER, 1895.

Edited monthly by C. A. L. Totten, New Haven, Conn.

Entered at the Post Office, New Haven, Conn., as second-class matter.

Copyrighted 1895, by C. A. L. Totten, to secure accuracy, and prevent misrepresentations. Those who desire to secure advance sheets of these Leaflets in time for CONTEMPORARY PUBLICATION in the columns of the Secular and Religious Press are referred to the Our Race Publishing Company, New Haven, Conn., with whom all future articles will be syndicated.

Published by the Our Race Publishing Company, New Haven, Conn. Price, \$1.00 for XIII. Numbers, Ten cents each.

For Personal, Direct and Mutual Service. Subscribe at Once!

N. B.—These News-Leaflets take the place of such fugitive articles as were formerly given to the general Press by the author, and constitute a monthly letter to such as are interested in the Signs of the Times.

CONTENTS:

NOTES AND QUERIES.

"SEED OR PLANT?"

USE "THAT" INSTEAD OF "THIS."

WHEN THE LAST SUPPER OCCURRED.

ΤΡΑ ΤΕΡΜΗ, THE "TENDER TWIG."

DISAGREEMENT OF DOCTORS.

A SOUND ADVENT JOURNAL WANTED.

SUBSCRIPTIONS DUE; PLEASE RENEW.

This number, XL. is No. 1 on the *New or 4th Set* of News Leaflets. If you have already subscribed it will be continued, but if all others who wish it continued do not promptly reply, we shall be *forced* to discontinue the issue altogether! The issue of the Daniel chart has completely used up our regular working surplus, so that our available funds are more nearly *exhausted* than they have ever been before. We trust, therefore, that all our friends will reply at once. Although the last set consisted of but five issues, it still spanned thirteen numbers by measure, and was a very expensive one on account of its tabular work. Regular publishers would have held the Tables (xxviii.-xxxiii.) and Chart (xxxvi.-xxxix.) at a very much higher price. This sort of work, however, has absolutely *no* commercial value at all, as is proved by the fact that we have not sold a single set of the tables, nor one solitary chart, except to News Leaflet subscribers. As we have no means of reaching the great body of true and faithful Bible students, for lack of means to advertise, we must rely on those we have already interested either to further the work *alone*, or else to go out into the by-ways and compel their neighbors to come in to our assistance. We do not think we ought to stop the News Leaflets. Do you? Nor shall we, if our friends will go on with us. The work can then go on even if our numbers do not increase, while if they can draw in others to us we can increase its scope.

Your own subscription is due.

If it is inconvenient to advance the subscription price at present, a mere notice by Postal Card to that effect, and stating that you desire the News Leaflet *continued*, will insure the transfer of the name of any *Regular Subscriber* to the New List. In all such cases, when eventually remitting, be sure to mention the fact that "the money is to pay for the *current* Set of News Leaflets which I have received up to date," so we will not duplicate through a misunderstanding of the circumstances.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

"SEED OR PLANT?"

**** Query:** "Which was first, the seed, or the plant that produced it?—A. L."

Reply: This is a repetition of an old question of the schoolmen. It and similar questions excited rabid controversy some centuries ago. The Bible itself settles the question scientifically and *reasonably*. In Genesis ii. 5, we learn that the vegetable kingdom sprang from seeds. "And every plant of the field *before* it was in the earth, and every herb of the field *before* it *grew*." Hebrew, *before it sprouted or germinated*, זָרָא hence in seed form. All this occurred in the 3d creative "Day;" during it and the 4th creative period these Plants and Herbs grew to maturity, bore seed and multiplied against the need of them, for food on the 5th "Day," in which Fish and Fowl, and on the 6th "Day," in which Animals and Man were created, and would need them. We are not specifically informed by inspiration as to whether fish and fowl followed the same law of creation, *i. e.*, from the egg to the developed creature, but there seems to be no reasonable objection to a continuation of the general law of "seed first," in their respect. At any rate the Bible pronounces against any phase of evolution, so called or defined, in that every species of life is expressly stated to have had *its own seed within itself* and to have brought forth "*according to its kind*," and not according to some other or higher kind (Gen. i. 11, 12, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29). The special creative act as to the first man Adam, the male of the Race (in whom is the seed), may most probably have followed the very same law, *i. e.*, of growth, from the seed upwards, organ to organ being duly added, while yet as it were none of them were before, *i. e.*, a growing so to speak from the very dust held (housed or wombed) in the formative hands of the Creator, and realizing his ideal (Psa. cxxxix. 14-16) as the work progressed, until he invigorated it by that final act of inspiration, or the breathing into it of the breath (*nishma*) of life (*chai*) by virtue of which man became a living creature (*nephesh chai*, Gen. i. 21, ii. 7). In other words, I am forced not merely to speculate in these premises but to read that man was made "in the bowels of the earth," in the womb of the morning, and finished ere he lived, even as all the sons of men,

his successive seed, are similarly formed; they none of them becoming breathing or living creatures until actually born out into the air.* It seems therefore, and volumes could be written in support thereof, that creation springs from the seed first, and that the law continues to dominate in all departments of existence. Spontaneous development has been exploded—generation from the ever-present spores of the lower forms of life, obtains everywhere. Given the proper conditions, and life springs from the seed on every hand.

USE "THAT" INSTEAD OF "THIS."

** *Query*: "In the verse, 'Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away until all these things be fulfilled.' I remember reading an article (in one of our daily newspapers) of yours, in which you stated that the word translated 'this' should be that (and not this).

"May I ask you, is this a positive fact and truth? Does the arrangement of the Greek words in that verse with their verbs, etc., and tenses, past, present and future, positively show that the Greek word '*αυτη*' (*haute*), as it stands, in its position in the original, means '*that* generation,' or, is there not something connected with that same verse (a tense or verb or something) that shows that the word '*αυτη*' (*haute*) must be translated by a word in the English to convey that the present tense was meant, and thus the word 'this' should be used (to be correct) and not 'that.' Kindly oblige me with an answer, as I hope from my heart you are correct.—F. E. H."

Reply: We, ourselves, in ordinary colloquial language, often use these very words interchangeably without in the least confusing our meaning before intelligent people. For instance our topic being a certain Presidential Administration it is quite as natural to refer to it through the medium of one word as the other. Thus in discussing Washington's day we could exclaim, "I tell you, republican manners in this day were plain, and patriotism primitive," yet the word *that* could have been used with a varied and perhaps finer degree of analytical force had we so elected. The word "*that*" specifies the particular day best, *i. e.*, if it be past or future to the day of conversation, but the word "*this*" implies a conscious conviction that the audience understands what day is under discussion. The speaker elects the use, but if we report him we must do so accurately.

In the Greek the two words "*this*" and "*that*" are primarily rendered by *tauten* (*ταυτην*) and *hautē* (*αυτη*) respectively, or by variations from their roots. There are two

* The breathing of a new-born babe has frequently to be started artificially by blowing in the face or nostrils.

splendid examples of the analytical use of these two words given in the Greek versions of our Saviour's Conversation, but the distinctive force of which is ruined by translating both words by the same English word, to wit, "*this*."

We can perhaps best explain the fundamental and analytical difference between these two Greek words by saying that *tauten*, or *tauta*, primarily means *this*, *the same*, etc. In fact we obtain our word *tautological* therefrom, and its fundamental significance is held closely down to the *present* place, person or time, whereas *haute* has a sense of displacement, as away from *this* and over to *that* place, time, or person. The entire modern discussion concerning the force of these two words in the Saviour's discourse has arisen from the ill-advised use of the same English word "*this*" in rendering both of these Greek words in two important prophecies which manifestly relate to two very different generations, to wit, *that*, of the Beginning of troubles, and *this*, of the End thereof.

In the first place the Saviour undoubtedly spoke in Hebrew, is reported in Greek, and, though we have two words, *this* and *that*, which exactly convey his reported meaning, every shade of distinction is lost by useless tautology in the English translation. The fact is the translators do not seem to have had any fixed and consistent rule in translating these and other similar particles of speech, but to have preferred their own ideas with a view to insuring a sort of local English euphony, even at the expense of exactness.

To point out the loss we have thus suffered let us examine the two sentences around which the controversy has thus sprung up. The first occurs in his last conversation with the Scribes, Rulers and Pharisees, on the Tuesday before his Crucifixion. He had just predicted the ills in store for *them*, *in their own generation*, and went to say, "Verily I say unto you, all these (*ταυτα*, *tauta*) things shall come upon this (*ταυτην*, *tauten*) generation" (Matt. xxiii. 36). Here the translation is correct and to the point, as it gives to *tauta* and *tauten* their *primary* signification. Some hours later, however, and after a long discourse whose prophetic scope extended over some 19 centuries, he had occasion to specify the circumstances surrounding *their* far off terminal generation. To point his meaning he introduced the Parable of the Fig Tree; for he expressly told them that of that day itself, and hour, no man, not even an angel could teach them the date, but the Father only—as we expect he will, some of us, and that before it arrives. It was manifestly a day far in the future of their own generation which that morning he had specified by *ταυτην* (*tauten*), "*this*;" so in contradistinction he used a word that Matthew's interpretation rendered into an entirely different Greek one, *αυτη* (*haute*),

"that" but which our translators' lack of inspiration, aye lack of even common consistency and appreciation of a difference, tautologically ruined by using the same English word *this*, as though *tauten* had been employed by Matthew. The correct translation of the sentence is as follows: "Verily I say unto you, that particular generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled" (Matt. xxiv. 34). The particles are different, not the same; *tauten* in one case, and *haute* in the other; the degree of Greek intensity is much greater in the latter instance than in the former, "not not may the generation that" (Matt. xxiv. 34) *versus* "not may this generation" (Matt. xxiii. 36); and even if we allow the elastic force of the double English use of the word *this* (where the future tense of the topic is fully held by the sense of the audience, as we have allowed in a former discussion, see Olivet Discourse, page 155, "Not not may this particular generation") there should be no doubt among open-minded readers as to what he meant. Granville Penn renders the latter sentence, "I tell you that that generation shall not pass away until all these (*ταυτα*!) things be done—he *genea haute*—that generation; not this generation, as our English version has erroneously rendered" (Supplementary Annotations to the New Covenant). Moreover in the very next paragraph, where he again refers to "*that* day and hour" as beyond his province to divulge, he specifies it by yet another Greek word (*εκεινος*, *ekeinos*) which is properly and should always be, rendered by the English word "*that*."* Thus *ekeinos* and *haute* referring specifically to the very same generation, and *ekeinos* necessarily meaning that, and *haute* properly meaning the same, and both being used by Matthew rather than *tauten*, "this," whose use he had already exhausted, leave no room for further dispute among men who value time, and have any powers of analysis worth honoring.

We got into this controversy quite innocently, years ago (see Study Number Seven, pp. 68-69, where the editors of *The Independent* and *Christian at Work* took to sneering at our manifestly proper rendering of Luke xxi. 32 as "that generation"), and we think our lines were ably defended at the time (see Study Number Seven, pp. 103-104). And since those days the advanced consensus of Greek scholarship has steadily veered around to our position. We therefore see no subsequent reason for a change of base, and are more than ever satisfied that the Saviour referred to the fig-tree generation as "that generation" in contradistinction to his own, which he specified as "this generation," and we furthermore believe that

* We know of but one exception in the translation of the New Testament, to wit: Matt. xxiv. 43, and we doubt the propriety even of that exception where the word is even more forcible if left "*that*."

what was "that generation" in those days is "this generation" in ours, even the final one of the present Gentile times and seasons.

WHEN THE LAST SUPPER OCCURRED.

*** * Query:** "Please explain the relation of Mark xiv. 12, and Luke xxii. 7, to a Thursday crucifixion preceded by the last supper at the sunset beginning of that particular Thursday; the difficulty being that the verses appear to cover a conversation that occurred on the day before that supper, to wit: on Wednesday afternoon, as you also seem to understand it. It would seem however that the supper Jesus ate with his disciples must have been eaten on that night (Thursday) instead of Wednesday night as you set forth. You no doubt have a good harmony for the passages in question and it would be gratifying to learn how you harmonize them.—J. S. A. and R. K. C."

Reply: We have discussed this at some length in Study Number Fifteen, pages 63-72, particularly on page 68, which kindly examine. There are several facts to be clearly fixed in the mind before we attempt to understand the full import of these texts. In the first place the supper is believed to have been eaten on what *we moderns* would designate as "Wednesday night (our Wednesday not ending till midnight of March 16th) but, according to the then current Hebrew method of reckoning days, Thursday, *i. e.*, the 5th day of the week began at the sundown of our Wednesday. The matter may be blocked out thus:

Midnight.	Sunrise.	Noon.	Sunset.	Midnight.	Sunrise.	Noon.	Sunset.	Midnight.
Modern Civil Wednesday, March 16th, 29 A.D.				Modern Civil Thursday, March 17th, 29 A.D.				
		a	b	c	d	e		
Hebrew Wednesday, March 16th, 29 A.D. Nisan 13th.				Hebrew Thursday, March 17th, 29 A.D. Nisan 14th.				Feast Day.
a Conversation.				b Supper.				
				c Trial.				
				d Crucifixion.				
				e Death.				

From the above it will be seen that the disciples asked the Lord where he would eat the *Passover*, and obtained their reply on the 16th of March. More than a whole day intervened

on both the modern civil and the Hebrew sunset scales, between this preparatory question and the Feast in contemplation.

This 16th day of March was Nisan 13th, towards the end of which the Jews began to cast away the leaven, hence it was called the "Beginning of Unleaven," and preceded the "Preparation day," just as the latter preceded the "Feast-day." Hebrew custom made it the Beginning of Unleaven, so that Matthew (xxvi. 17) and Mark (xiv. 12) do not confuse terms in applying the designation of "Unleaven" to the 13th, any more than Luke (xxii. 7) does by calling the 14th, or day of Preparation, a day of unleaven; for neither the 13th nor the 14th belong to the Legal Mosaic 7 days of unleaven bread, because those days are the 15th to the 21st inclusive, and none others! But the three Evangelists mention facts, in current colloquial terms and we must interpret them according to the circumstances. That the Mosaic law does not recognize either of these days as of and in the 7 feast days of unleavened bread, in that they preceded the Feast day which was the first of the 7, has nothing to do with what the Jews had come to conform to upon these preliminary days.

Moses does not refer to the Feast of Dedication, because it arose long subsequently to his time, nevertheless the Saviour went to one during his brief and busy ministry and no one would think of disputing its validity or that of the designation given to it. The date of the Crucifixion is settled by entirely different conditions than those involved in this discussion, and that it was on Thursday the 17th of March 29 A.D., that year the 14th of Nisan, fixes the Lord's supper at its beginning on our Wednesday evening, and therefore necessarily sets back the conversation with the Lord to the preceding afternoon which of course was Wednesday, March 16, Nisan 13, on both reckonings.

The primary modern difficulty over these and collateral crucifixion data springs from the deeply embedded idea that the crucifixion was on a Friday, Nisan 15th; because at some stage of our Christian lives we have been so taught, and because whether we know better or not we still live in the atmosphere of myriads whose daily converse is based upon that erroneous supposition. The secondary difficulty has come from the misunderstanding of these very texts, in that we have confused the colloquial Jewish terms first day of Unleavened bread, and Beginning of unleavened cakes, with the Mosaic First day of the Seven legal days of the Feast itself. As a matter of fact the Jews began to put away leaven towards the end of the 13th, finished their search for it by early candle light on the 14th, and went without it from the 15th to the 21st inclusive; so in those latter days they had parts of nine, and cer-

tainly the whole of eight days, that fell under their own definition and were designated accordingly.

Finally, and wholly aside from all these facts and the reasonable conclusions based on them, I personally should find no real difficulty with such a verse as Luke xxii. 7, because the broad chronological circumstances involved would force me to understand it in the latitude of an *introduction* to what the narrator was about to detail. Whether the facts thus introduced preceded, succeeded, or fell upon the day mentioned, is to be gathered from the context, and collateral evidence, and it is repugnant to reason to adopt so close a construction as to destroy far more important and independent conditions otherwise well established! To my mind, then, this seventh verse, "Now the day of unleavened bread *came*," has a similar constructive force to that of the first verse, "Now the feast of unleavened bread * * * *drew near*." They are both to be taken in the narrative or introductory sense. The first verse introduces two whole chapters of events that preceded the Feast itself, and the seventh verse merely serves to fix the mind upon its Preparation day. Luke then goes on to relate events that both preceded and ran over into it—because the collateral testimony of the other gospels demands this on pain of confusion. Mark xiv. 17 shows that the preceding verse 12 refers to the Hebrew day *before* the Preparation day. Hence the clause, "when they slew the Passover," must be taken as qualifying the single word "unleaven-cakes" only, and not the whole antecedent clause; for the word "*evening*" (verse 17) brings on another day which *was* the Preparation day on which the killing both of Jesus and the other Lambs took place; and therefore this conversation, and the preparations for their own participation in the approaching Feast must all have preceded the Preparation day itself. We do not dispute the difficulty involved in getting at these facts, and the confusion, more apparent, however, than real, that arises from Luke's narrative style; but we are satisfied that those who are more anxious to get at what he *must have meant*, than to contend for what they sometime *have supposed* he meant, will come to see this matter just as we do. If it be not clear at once we suggest that you dismiss it from your minds and suffer it to lie fallow for awhile. It will then in due time come up for reconsideration, and we doubt not that the mind will grasp the broader and more liberal consensus of the matter at a glance.

TEA TEPHI, THE TENDER TWIG.

* * * *Query*: "Will you please tell me where I can find 'Tea Tephi' in the Bible?—J. M. S."

Reply: You cannot find her by name, but can easily do so by implication. Had she and her history been *fully* set forth

upon the pages of Holy Writ, the very end in view, which was secrecy, would have been *defeated*! This thing was done with caution; but there is ample evidence now within reach of fair investigation to show us how it was done. In the first place Jeremiah had to build and to plant (Jer. i. 10) a remnant (xlii. 10-11) somewhere. His own life was guaranteed to him (i. 8, 18-19), and that of his friend, Ebed Melech (xxxix. 18) and that of Baruch (xlv. 5) his scribe. He was also made the specific guardian of the king's daughters (xli. 10, 14-16; xliii. 6), who were his own great-grandchildren, because Zedekiah was his grandson, to wit: the son of Josiah and the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, who only became Jeremiah of Anathoth (Jer. i. 1) by virtue of a long subsequent purchase from his cousin (xxxii. 7). Now this favored remnant was forcibly taken to Egypt, but disappears therefrom in its subsequent overturning by Nebuchadnezzar. And so Jeremiah and his friends became lost to current Eastern records. But not lost to God, nor to *Western* records! for right here Irish history is invaded at Tarah by just such a remnant, rich in just the sort of treasures Jeremiah had in keeping (II. Mac. ii. 4, etc.), the Harp, the Breast Plate, the Lia Phail, probably the Ark, and certainly a beautiful princess from Egypt named *Tea Tephi*. Their tombs and fame remain there yet, their descendants sit upon the throne of Britain, and the whole romance completely solves Ezekiel's Riddle (Ezek. xvii.), where we believe that the Tender Twig of the topmost branch of the Lofty Cedar, which was planted in a city of merchants, in a land of traffic, beside great waters, has been fully shown to have been none other than Tea Tephi herself, the daughter of David! There are two lines, the Literal and the Spiritual, and both were saved by women. By virtue of Tea Tephi's descendants on the throne of Israel, David has never yet wanted a man to wield the sceptre, nor has that sceptre departed from Judah to this day; while, by virtue of Mary, He whose greater right it is to rule, as the oldest living claimant to that same throne, will of course take it when he comes again. We cannot condense into a few lines what we found even three Studies much too cramped to treat according to its absorbing merit, but must refer you once more to a re-perusal of Study Number Three, "*Tea Tephi, David's Daughter, Jeremiah's Ward*," to its sequel, Study Number Four, "*The Flight of David's Line*," or how they reached the West; and to its conclusion, Study Number Five, "*The Knight of the Scarlet Thread*," or the story of the Royal son of Judah in the Zarah-line that married her. From this marriage Victoria is a direct descendant, and it will probably be shown in time that all the royal families in Europe are both Jewish and Davidic in every sense of the word.

DISAGREEMENT OF DOCTORS.

**** Query:** "As usual I am in perplexity over the disagreement of your date of the birth of Christ, Tebeth 7th, and Professor Dimbleby's Casleu 24th. However I think you have gone into it more thoroughly. But you both use the same calendar, and the 25th of December is used by both, and I can't reconcile it.—MRS. M. E. M."

Reply: We merely agree with Professor Dimbleby that the First Adam must have been "3996 years old" at the birth of the Second Adam, and we have published a consecutive scale of years covering that interval. We have produced our case, and supplemented it by a concert of closely related chronological facts all in order and duly tied together, and yet braced apart here and there by an exhaustive number of checks and cross-references. The work covers many volumes (instead of a single pamphlet without much proof) and we are not conscious of having overlooked a solitary link in the chain. We have also verified the generally accepted date of the Nativity (*circa* Dec. 25th, 4 B.C. = 4710 J.P.) and both found and published our reasons for accepting it. We have, in addition to all this ante-Nativity Chronology printed a Harmonized Scale of Time which can be opened opposite the current year 1895 A.D. (see page 278, Study Number Fifteen) and followed back (to page 153, and thence *via* Study Number Ten, page 152) to the Nativity year in question (Page 88, Study Number Ten).

Our fellow students therefore have this end of the Scale in their hands, and can verify its agreement with the best current science and history by consulting any standard Nautical Almanac. With this end of the scale unimpeachable, and with the whole of it, like a tape-measure, in full view, we have made our companions independent of any mere *ipse dixit* of our own. Further, in the Tables published in Leaflets Numbers XXVIII-XXXIII. we have picked up, as on an inelastic rod, all the important chronological beads that are found actually dated in History between the birth of Herod and the death of John the Evangelist. And finally in Studies Numbers Fourteen and Fifteen we have minutely welded together the more important section that includes the Saviour's human life from its start to its finish.

In the length of that life we disagree with Professor Dimbleby, he following the generally accepted idea that it covered $33\frac{1}{2}$ years and ended in 31 A.D., we, that it covered but $31\frac{1}{2}$ years and ended in 29 A.D. He makes the Ministry to have been its last $3\frac{1}{2}$ years; we, its last 62 weeks. He, the Crucifixion on a Friday; we, on a Thursday. He has continued in the Fog that surrounds a misunderstanding of Daniel ix., and we presume that you have long ago come out of it with us.

Now in Study Number Fifteen (pp. 358-366) it has been shown so that our 15-year-old son understands it that March 17, 29 A.D. was a Thursday, and in a rather more complex calculation (pp. 24-114 same Study) that that Thursday was the 14th of Nisan and the day of the Crucifixion. But this being proved, to wit, that the 14th of Nisan, 29 A.D., was March 17th, it follows, by a similar calculation, to that employed on pages 358-366), that December 25, 4 B.C., was Tebeth 7, 3996 A.M., and did not fall in Casleu as Professor Dimbleby *supposed*, for we cannot believe he actually hunted down the date so carefully as we have. He certainly has not published his figures from our day back to that, and we have placed ours at your disposal.* We think the Professor has made a mistake, and that he and all others will continue in corresponding error until they accept the proper lengths for the Life and Ministry of the Saviour, and the correct year, month and week-day for the Crucifixion. The fact is, Professor Dimbleby has labored under a misunderstanding of the Book of Daniel, but no reader of this Series of Studies need err therein. Nevertheless, we doubt if we had ever understood that wonderful book ourselves had it not been for the Professor's own pioneer and original work in Chronology.

We owe to him a great deal and we deeply regret that he will not suffer us to pay some of it back; and so the debt you owe to the Truth through our mere agency may be upon the other side to-morrow, for by putting as much work upon the new foundations, as we have put upon the old, who shall say where the balance shall swing next? Let us pray chiefly for wisdom, and for understanding wherewith to know it, and withal for consistency enough to change our minds as often as an accredited agent shows to us a better way than we had found ourselves. We are only at the borderland of Truth, let us come out of Egypt with all of our possessions except the flesh pots thereof! The Exodus was in 2513 A. M., and Daniel was born in 3381 A. M. That was 2513 years ago this fall (3381 A. M. $\div$ 2513 = 5894 A. M.) It is significant that by the publication of the Daniel chart upon this very anniversary (Sept. 23, 5894) he is enabled to stand at least metaphorically in his lot! We trust many will recognize the truth at sight and follow on to know it in all its aspects. The time from Adam to this auspicious date bisects at 2947 A. M. ($2 \times 2947 = 5894$), the most critical year in David's life (see Study Number Eight, page 158). David stood midway between the Exodus

* They have all been verified by Brother Frank U. Downing, of Columbus, Georgia, and their vindication proves that Professor Dimbleby's date should also have been Tebeth 7th instead of Casleu 24th, for that is where December 25th, 4 B.C., necessarily falls when we reverse the dates from Thursday, March 17th = Nisan 14th, 29 A.D., as you can easily determine for yourself.

and Daniel, *i. e.*, 62 weeks of years each way ($2513 \text{ A. M.} + 434 = 2947$; $2947 + 434 = 3381 \text{ A. M.}$); verily the true chronology is full of remarkable suggestions—as it should be. Search them out!

A SOUND ADVENT JOURNAL WANTED.

** * Query*, from England: "It is only lately I have given up Futurism as a mistaken idea, and it makes me the more interested in the historical fulfillment so clearly set forth in the Our Race Series. Do you know any English or American weekly or monthly publication which discusses the Second Advent of our Lord on entirely historical lines? If so, would it be convenient to mention it in your next Leaflet?—MRS. G. B."

Reply: We regret our inability to give the title of such a journal. We do not know of one that fills the rôle. Of course the current *orthodox* religious newspapers are founded for other than Advent purposes, and either eschew the whole topic or else refer to it only for the purpose of condemning its advocates, save where in general terms, and as of secondary importance, they treat of the Advent as at least remote; while the objection we find to the host of smaller papers issued by the various divisions of so-called Second Adventists is that their chief object is to voice loudly that particular line of doctrine about which each one of them severally rallies, and to make the Advent itself and the broader truths of really secondary importance, or else work upon history that has been run to fit their own interpretation of prophecy. Then, primarily, even where this objection has the least force, the management of these papers in general is so unchristian and so presumptuously hidebound to their own system of interpretation that there is no opening made in their columns even for the fair treatment or review of any biblical truth that militates against whatsoever scheme of chronology their own narrow-minded editors have elected to follow. We speak whereof we well know, and testify of what we have over and over again experienced in these premises. We exchange with numerous of these papers and in duty bound have to judge them by the fruit our own labors have borne in their directions.

Had our work been wicked and with intent to destroy biblical truth we believe it had been more widely discussed by them than it has been for its fairness, and for the great volume of truth it has added to the library of sound biblical vindication. Our labors have not been done in the dark, nor have these demonstrations of tremendous discoveries been withheld from them; nevertheless, they have almost without exception either suppressed all reference to the results, or else so belittled or denied them that their own constituents are either uninformed, or else wholly misinformed, even as to what we claim to have found out.

As to our arguments and proofs, their attitude shows they do not dare to state them plainly perhaps for fear their reasonableness will play havoc with their own constituencies, or else because they have deliberately conspired to fight the truth itself if it turns out to be so radical as our investigations promise.

We have cut a good many eye-teeth since we left the honorable profession of arms and innocently cast our lot among those who do not push even their preaching into practice; for while their editorials are liberal enough, their columns are closed as tight as the Roman List Expurgatis against the results of those who differ with them. We would not have believed five years ago that this spirit actually dominated the journals that decry it so justly in the Larger Orthodox organs. The shoe fits them best! And what after all do they teach! Let us see. Aside from diverse doctrines, true or false, probably it is safe to say that no two of them agree throughout on a common system of Biblical chronology from Adam to the present time! The fact is we do not know one of them that has put into published sight a complete, consecutive and itemized statement of even their own position. On the other hand we have done this, and have endeavored to fortify every step of our historical progress across the entire canon of the Scriptures. And, God willing, either we or our successors hope to carry the system down to whatsoever year is then current when it is completed.

In the second place everyone of these professed searchers after, and venders of new light, equally with the more orthodox journals, hugs to the radical error of the long life (33 to 37 years), and the long ministry of the Saviour (three, four or five passovers), and to yearly, monthly and weekly dates for the crucifixion which (unless Thursday, March 17, 29 A.D. be hit upon) they cannot harmonize with all the historical facts involved, to say nothing of the prophetic conditions which they coolly ignore or warp. They have neither accepted the light offered them nor attempted to *prove* it to be a false beacon. On the other hand we preach the simplest and most easily proved chronological truth to be found upon the face of the Bible, to wit, that the Saviour's life was but $31\frac{1}{4}$ years long, and that his ministry was a brief span of but sixty-two literal weeks from his baptism to his death. Failing to see, or seeing, failing to accept and to preach this truth *with credit where it belongs* (and we rarely obtain credit of those who use our heifers whichever one they take), or seeing its error and failing to pursue it without quarter, these teachers without eyes that perceive or ears that appreciate the purport of this statement, continue to lead others equally blind and deaf

adown the path that starts anywhere and literally leadeth nowhere—chronologically.

And as a dismal result they have as many clashing solutions of the Book of Daniel as they have of Chronology in general, and not one of them by any possibility correct; because their History is all wrong—not by our mere dictum but by proofs cited and not answered, and we claim unanswerable.

How on earth can they publish the truth as to the Second Advent or discuss its phases upon *sound* HISTORICAL *principles* under such circumstances? Why, they do not understand the times and seasons of the FIRST Advent and positively reject instruction thereon. Will the Spirit, forsooth, reveal to such searchers his secrets as to the Second!

God forbid that it should pass their way for fear of being stifled or suppressed, and God send it to such only as value historical facts at their supreme worth, in that they establish, and they alone *can* establish, the righteousness of his servants the prophets.

No, we cannot recommend, nor do we know the name of a solitary journal that advocates the Second Advent clearly and upon sound Historical foundations, nor of one that is sound even upon Prophetical foundations. If we knew of such an one the present phase of our work would be so well-nigh over that we could lay our lines for still broader work upon the lecture field and obtain that change of venue that is necessary to a fair trial in the premises. We promise these papers some trouble, in God's name, and some judgments, if we lay down our pen and are permitted to meet the people face to face,—the which we earnestly hope to do not long hence.

The standard secular Chronology of our day is radically defective in its date of the Olympiads, the death of Julius Cæsar, upon a thousand dependent measures, and on the Life and Ministry of Jesus Christ in particular. It has not left Daniel out of the problem, but is none the less vitiated by the work of chronologists who have misunderstood him and have not hesitated to "fudge" with History in order to make it fit their interpretations of Prophecy, and the less said the better about the bastard systems that emanate yearly by the score from a thousand and one different so-called Advent camps. The calculations based on such vaporisms are positive bids for disbelief, in that all of them, without exception, cannot but end in dismal failure—if God be true! For he has made HISTORY the criterion, and they have made their own interpretations of Prophecy the standard, to his discredit! This is "putting the cart before the horse" with a vengeance!

There is only one principle that is safe and we are striving to follow it—to let Prophecy alone, until one gets History har-

monized; *i. e.*, to get the facts, all the facts, and nothing but the facts any way. So much the worse for the prophet if the facts fail to fit his side of the case, and so much the better for the reward of Faith if they do! We will take our own chances on this basis anywhere in creation, and on general principles we pity the chances of those who work for Biblical vindication upon any other.

Once more, then, we protest against the reception our gratuitous labors in behalf of the honor of God's Word among men has obtained among his professed followers. Their treatment of our work belies their pretensions, and to the extent in which the equally responsible shepherds in high places have said aught against it, *and yet known naught and proved less against it*, to that same extent and more also we dread the reaction, so far as they are concerned, when it arrives!

One cannot but view the attitude of some of our clerical and editorial critics with sheer amazement. In the first place they become almost rabid at our advocacy of the identity of the English-speaking race with the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel. In the meantime the ranks of the orthodox are saturated with enough higher critical poison to offset a thousand times so mild an error even were it fairly proved to be one. But these same authorities dare not take up the counter arguments, because every one they produce reacts with double force against their own position. For instance, we challenge them to overturn our *argumentum ad hominem* (see Study Number One). Come produce your counter case; our own has stood for a full week of years* and not a solitary voice has shown its fallacy.

No one pretends that a belief in our identity with Lost Israel will of itself save a soul alive, but we do maintain that it will open up the beauty of the truth, and lead Israel to self consciousness, and so onwards unto God, from whom the higher critics withdraw day by day!

When one goes a-nutting in the woods he identifies walnuts by the shucks that surround them, and if he has any sense can tell this tree from that of a button-ball. We have carried home many a bushel, shucks and all, and were never fooled with button balls. If the shuck is "no good," as the boys say, we admit it, in the sense they mean, but in no other. For else to what purpose is it a part of God's economy? But the walnut itself, says one, is better; granted, yet this only to crack for the meat is still better, and to eat it around the hearth in the old New England homestead is much the best after all.

And so with Christianity: to appropriate its truths is of course the real end in view, but the eater only obtains the

* First published in 1888.

meat, after cracking the nuts, and that after drying and shucking, and even that after getting the hamper full in the woods. Which does the boy enjoy most eagerly? Of course the pleasure of the search! and yet after all, the memory of each step in the winter evening as he eats. We readily grant that Anglo-Israelism is the mere husk that surrounds far greater truths, but we maintain the husk is an essential part of Biblical truth, and that to go a-nutting on Mount Lebanon, and find the truth even in a husk is far better, and more generally attractive, than to buy a nickel's worth of doubtful meat of an unknown and unlicensed street vender.

The fact is, there are three fundamental truths before which the Bible becomes a new book and beneath the influence of which men are destined yet to come to Christ by shoals where now they do not come at all. They are based on sound history. The first is the truth of Anglo-Israelism.

The second is a systematic chronology that harmonizes History; for such a system alone can verify Prophecy!

The third is the sixty-two-week ministry which harmonizes the Gospels.

If you can afford to oppose them, produce your *reasons*! for facts only talk in these premises, and while sneers and ridicule are played out, silence is as unrighteous as positive falsification. We, who do advocate "sound historical principles," with proof and references, have actually had fairer treatment at the hands of the common secular press, for what we teach has been more fairly set forth therein, than at those of the journals which write the smoothest and most pious editorials.

For instance, here are two more samples of the style of reviews we obtain from the two classes of religious journals under consideration. Of course they are edited by clergymen. *The Churchman* of last August 3d suppresses all titles, publisher and prices, and having deliberately misrepresented in general what we *are* doing coolly implies that *their own dissent*, for they give no other reason, is sufficient to demolish the whole fabric of our one-year ministry. The way they hoodwink their own readers is as follows:

"We have received from the 'Our Race' Publishing Company, Nos. 14 and 15 of series four of their quarterly Periodical. This is the work of Lieut. Totten, who has devoted himself to the unprofitable task of interpreting the arithmetic of prophecy, and proving to his own satisfaction when the Second Advent will take place. We admire the research and ability shown in these papers, but we cannot help feeling that they are all governed by a foregone conclusion, and that all facts of history and calculations of science are compelled to bend to it. For instance, we quite dissent from the author's views that the

ministry of the Lord lasted but one year, and if this gives way, his whole fabric is demolished.

"We are satisfied to rest in the Lord's own decisive words, spoken not to the apostles only, but to His whole Church in all time: 'It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power.' And since the failure of every attempt to predict the day and hour of the Lord's second coming only weakens the faith of mankind in that most important article of the creed, 'that He will come,' we cannot regard with favor any such efforts as these."

We have a large number of Episcopal clergymen on our lists, and they with us are ashamed of the *Churchman*.

Again, *The Herald of the Coming One* (July 31, 1895) puts out our light as follows:

"*Facts of Stone*. By Prof. C. A. L. Totten. (New Haven, Conn.: Our Race publishing Co. pp. 366. Price 75 cents). This is No. 15 of Our Race Series for the first quarter of 1895, and is the second part of the study on the times and seasons of Rome. This part treats of the Man of History, Jesus of Nazareth. It begins with the year of the crucifixion, and ends at the commencement of the Apostolic age. He sums up what he thinks has been set forth, as follows: 'We have now two strings to our Chronological Bow! The one stretches from Adam down to Christ according to the years of the genealogies. * * * It is 4027 A.M. years long and ends at March 17, 29 A.D.' 'The Harmonized Scale of Time which we have now brought down to date, supplies the other string to our Bow. It stretches from our day back to that day. This string is 1866 years long.' He thus places the end of the six thousand years over one hundred years in the future. From what we know of Chronology, we question the credibility of what he calls the Harmonized Scale of Time."

It would be interesting to learn what the writer of the above *does* "know" about "Chronology," probably about as much as we ourselves did seven years ago, when we took it for granted that nothing could be gathered outside of the standard text-books. Well, all this confirms us in our predilections, we are tramps! Thank God we owe none of these men even for a meal of victuals, our predecessors have "posted them," and we too have passed their way—and if we are to judge by the fruit that hangs over their wall we might starve at their gates with Christ's badge on—yea, we had far rather so starve than sit in their chairs and endorse such journalism.

With this number (XL) we commence the *Fourth Set* of News Leaflets. Have you subscribed for them? Please see notice inside of front cover.

RE-MEMORANDUM.

The Our Race "NEWS-LEAFLETS."

Issued Monthly by C. A. L. TOTTEN.

Back Numbers. First Set. 1893. Price 75c.

I. Oct.	MIDNIGHT: THE LAST HOUR OF THE ERA, . . .	10c.
II. Nov.	MISCELLANEOUS, HISTORICAL, CHRONOLOGICAL, . . .	10c.
III. Dec.	MORE LIGHT ON THE CRUCIFIXION DATE, . . .	10c.
IV. Jan., 1894.	AN EPISTLE; "THE TIME IS AT HAND," . . .	10c.
V., VI., VII. Feb.	ST. PAUL'S LIFE AND LABORS, . . .	30c.
VIII., IX., X. Mar.	THE DAUGHTER OF AN EARL; AN IDYL OF LONDON TOWN. <i>For the Passover (Easter) Season.</i> N.B.—Gift Edition of this Idyl, Best Paper, suitable for a Souvenir, . . .	30c. 50c.
XI. Apr.	INSPIRATION, AND THE TREND OF MODERN CRITICISM. CONSTRUCTION OR DESTRUCTION, <i>Which?</i> . . .	10c.
XII. May.	ANSWERS TO NUMEROUS IMPORTANT QUERIES, HISTORICAL, CHRONOLOGICAL AND OTHERWISE, . . .	10c.
XIII. June.	SATURDAY <i>versus</i> SUNDAY. THE PRESENT PHASE OF AN OLD PIECE OF PHARISAISM! . . .	10c.

Back Numbers. Second Set. 1894. Price 75c.

XIV., XV. July.	FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE SABBATH QUESTION; A CONCLUSIVE ARGUMENT, . . .	20c.
XVI., XVII. Aug.	SIGNS OF THE TIMES; A <i>Startling</i> ARRAY! . . .	20c.
XVIII., XIX. Sept.	THE CHURCH AND STATE; A <i>Warning</i> , . . .	20c.
XX., XXI. Oct.	THE ONE YEAR MINISTRY DEMONSTRATED; LIGHT AT LAST, . . .	20c.
XXII., XXIII. Nov.	THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL; A LECTURE, . . .	20c.
XXIV., XXV., XXVI. Dec.	JUDAH, JUDEA AND JERUSALEM; THE LATEST NEWS; A VERY IMPORTANT PAPER, . . .	30c.

Current or Third Set. 1895. Price \$1.00.

XXVII. Jan.	THE GENEALOGY OF MARY, AND OTHER MATTERS, . . .	10c.
XXVIII-XXXIII. Feb., Mar., Apr.	"THE DIVIDING OF A TIME." A Set of Accurate, Colored Chronological Charts covering Secular and Sacred Chronology between the Birth of Herod the Great, and the Death of John the Evangelist. Very Important, . . .	75c.
XXXIV. May.	THE OLYMPIC SCALE PROVED FROM AFRICANUS CENSORINUS AND THEON OF ALEXANDRIA, . . .	10c.
XXXV-XXXVI. June.	THE OLIVET DISCOURSE. FIRST TO SECOND ADVENT. THE SAVIOUR'S COMMENTS, . . .	20c.
XXXVII. July.	THE WEDNESDAY THEORY OF THE WEEK-DAY OF THE CRUCIFIXION, CRITICALLY EXAMINED, . . .	10c.
XXXVIII-XXXIX. August.	JESUS CHRIST AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES. (Easter article in <i>New York World</i> , 1895, revised), . . .	35c.

NOTICE.—*First* or *Second* Set, postpaid to any address, 75c. each; *Third* or Current Set for \$1.00; *First* and *Second* Sets, and *Third* Set as issued, for \$2.25. Orders breaking Sets mailed only at the regular prices as above listed.

OUR RACE PUBLISHING COMPANY,

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

No Christian can afford to ignore these works. They have demonstrated their value. Not to have examined them **FOR YOURSELF**, is to assume a responsibility which in these days is, to say the least, **UNWISE**. Taste, and you will surely eat.

Professor Totten's Writings

Upon Historical and Prophetic Topics are comprised in the

OUR RACE ITS ORIGIN ITS DESTINY SERIES.

On Hand: Series I. 1891.

- No. 1. THE ROMANCE OF HISTORY; Lost Israel Found in the Anglo Saxons.
- No. 2. THE VOICE OF HISTORY; Joshua's Long Day and the Dial of Ahaz.
- No. 3. THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY; Tea Teph, Jeremiah's Ward.
- No. 4. THE SECRET OF HISTORY; The King's Daughters—Flight of David's Line.

On Hand: Series II. 1892.

- No. 5. THE RENEWAL OF HISTORY; Eochaidh the Heremonn—The "Scarlet Thread."
- No. 6. THE FACT OF HISTORY; The Deluge and the Advent—Proof and Guarantee.
- No. 7. THE HOPE OF HISTORY; The Crisis, and the Millennium—At Hand!
- No. 8. THE RIDDLE OF HISTORY; Saint Paul and Daniel Interpreted.

On Hand: Series III. 1893.

- No. 9. THE ANSWER OF HISTORY; Reply to objections companion to Study No. 1.
- No. 10. THE MEASURE OF HISTORY; A Standard Scale of Chronology.
- No. 11. THE TRUTH OF HISTORY. Facts of Gold. The Times and Seasons of Babylon.
- No. 12. THE HEART OF HISTORY. Facts of Silver. Medo-Persian Times and Seasons.

On Hand: Series IV. 1894.

- No. 13. THE KEY OF HISTORY. Facts of Copper. The Times and Seasons of Greece.
- No. 14. THE FOCUS OF HISTORY. Facts of Iron. The Times and Seasons of Rome.
- No. 15. THE MAN OF HISTORY. Facts of Stone. The Times of Christ.
- No. 16. THE CONFIRMATION OF HISTORY. (In preparation.)

Mailed, Postpaid, on Receipt of Price.

- SINGLE COPIES (breaking sets or packages), \$.75
- SAMPLE COPY (our selection),50

The following are "Regular Subscriptions."

- FOUR STUDIES, or either Series (your choice), \$2.00
- EIGHT STUDIES, or two Series (your choice), 3.65
- TWELVE STUDIES, or three Series (your choice), 5.00
- SIXTEEN STUDIES, or four Series (your choice), 6.56

OUR RACE PUBLISHING CO.,

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

These works have been written and edited by Professor Totten himself, and contain all of the essential data he has given to the PRESS during the entire course of his latter day testimony. Events themselves are rapidly verifying his deductions.