**“Throwing the Bible Aside” The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

A little over a year ago (Jan. 8, 1885) the *Christian at Work* used the following language:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.1}

“The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church, and on this basis, and none other, does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.2}

This is not very definite; for the “early Christian church” covers quite a space of time, including the time of Christ and the apostles; and people might be led to think that the *Christian at Work* claimed apostolic authority for Sunday observance. But that is not the case, as the following from the same paper, Feb. 18, 1886, shows:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.3}

“We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance, and for the reason that while the Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture, it is now seen, as it is admitted, that we must go to later than apostolic time for the establishment of Sunday observance.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.4}

Very true; and we knew it before the *Christian at Work* said it; for we have read the Bible. But here is a point for consideration. “The Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture,” we are told. Now what day is it that is thus identified in the Scriptures as the Sabbath? It is the seventh day, and no other. This the *Christian at Work* admits when it says that “the church” has taken the liberty of discarding the day designated in the fourth commandment, and that this was done this side the time of the apostles. We would ask, then, how it is possible to reconcile Sunday observance with reverence for the Bible. If a man takes the Bible, and that alone, as his guide, he must keep the seventh day of the week; and (according to the above quotations with which we agree), if he accept Sunday he must go directly against the Bible. It ought not to take any candid person long to decide what to do in this matter, for it is evident that “their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being judges.” And, besides, one who was foremost among the apostles has said: “But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.” E. J. W. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.5}

**“Perpetuity of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is impossible to discuss one branch of this great subject of the law without touching more or less upon every other branch. So in considering the nature of the law and its relation to the gospel, we have necessarily shown that it must endure forever. We shall not take up this branch more in detail. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.6}

The law of God is the righteousness of God. It may not be amiss to review the proof on this point. David, in these words, bears witness to the fact that the commandments are themselves righteousness: “My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness.” Psalm 119:172. Since there is no righteousness but that of God, the commandments must be his righteousness; but we have still more direct evidence. The prophet Isaiah thus contrasts the things of earth with the righteousness of God: “Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever; and my righteousness shall not be abolished.” Isaiah 51:6. In the next verse he proceeds to tell what this righteousness is: “Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law.” Because the law is the righteousness of God, it enables those who are instructed in it to “give judgment upon good or evil.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.7}

The text says, “My righteousness shall not be abolished.” Since there can be no question but that “righteousness” is here used with reference to the law of God, we may properly substitute “law” for “righteousness,” thus: “The earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my law shall not be abolished.” This gives the exact meaning, and is no more positive than we shall find stated elsewhere. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.8}

God is from everlasting to everlasting. Psalm 90:2. As he cannot exist separate from his nature, or, in other words, separate from himself, and the law is the transcript of his nature, it necessarily follows that the law exists from everlasting to everlasting. And since created beings, who are all subjects of God’s Government, cannot obey an abstract principle, but must have that principle clearly defined, we know that at least from the time that God created intelligent beings as subjects of his Government, the law must have existed in written form or must have been expressed in definite language. And from the beginning of his creation to everlasting ages, it must continue so to exist. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 134.9}

This is exactly what we are taught by the words of Christ in the sermon on the mount. Said he: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill (to ratify, establish, or teach). For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” Matthew 5:17, 18. Here two things are mentioned, the law and the prophets. Christ did not come to destroy either one. He came in fulfillment of prophecy, and also to teach the law, which he did in the sermon on the mount. He did not, however, fulfill all the prophecy; for some of it reaches far beyond his first advent. For instance in Psalm 89:20-29 we read the following prophecy concerning the kingdom of David, over which Christ, as the Son of David:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.1}

“I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him; with whom my hand shall be established; mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him; nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him; and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and *his throne as the days of heaven*.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.2}

In verses 35-37 we read further:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.3}

“Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.4}

Here is a prophecy that will be in process of fulfillment as long as the sun and moon endure, even to all the days of Heaven. Now the words of Christ are, that “one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.” Till all what be fulfilled? Evidently till all the prophets be fulfilled, for he is speaking of the prophets, in connection with the law. Then, in view of the prophecy that we just read, we know that not the slightest change can be made in the law so long as Christ reigns on the throne of David; and that will be throughout eternity. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.5}

Nothing can add to the force of this testimony. We may quote other texts, as, “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail” (Luke 16:17), or, “The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness” (Psalm 111:7, 8), but, strong as they are, they do not go beyond what has already been presented. To give all the texts which show the enduring nature of the law, would be to quote a large portion of the Bible. In our consideration of other points connected with this subject, many additional proofs will necessarily be brought in. But right here we wish to introduce a few quotations from eminent authors of different denominations, to show that they have used just as strong language as we have to set forth the holiness and perpetuity of the law. Bishop E. O. Haven said:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.6}

“Not only is every one of the ten commandments binding upon all men, [but] every one is often broken by persons who have received Christian instruction. The decalogue is God’s grand compendium of moral philosophy. Whoever obeys it in letter and spirit is a perfect man.”-“*Pillars of Truth*,” p. 7. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.7}

Again the same author says:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.8}

“This decalogue can never become obsolete. It was designed for all men, and, obeyed, would render all men noble, and worthy of immortal blessedness. It is a kind of concentration of the moral teachings of the Bible.”-“*Pillars of truth*,” p. 235. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.9}

The “Speaker’s Commentary,” on Matthew 12:8 says:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.10}

“On what principle of legislation can it be maintained that, because laws are imposed by the ruler for the benefit of the subject, therefore they may be dispensed with at his own convenience? This is utterly untenable as regards the laws of man, still more so as regards the laws of God.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.11}

Rev. S. P. Sprecher, pastor of Calvary Presbyterian Church San Francisco, in a sermon delivered Feb. 18, 1883, and reported in the *Occident* of Feb. 21, 1883, said:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.12}

“When God gave the ten commandments on Sinai, he did not propose that men should obey them if they commended themselves to the natural heart; but that they should obey because they were the voice of God. Truth is not always seen and appreciated at first. It generally requires a certain favorable state of the heart.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.13}

On the words of our Lord in Matthew 5:17, “I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill,” we find the following comment by Wesley, in the first volume of his works, sermon 25:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.14}

“Some have conceived our Lord to mean: I am come to fulfill this by my entire and perfect obedience to it. And it cannot be doubted but he did, in this sense, fulfill every part of it. But this does not appear to be what he intends here, being foreign to the scope of his present discourse. Without question, his meaning in that place is (consistently with all that goes before and follows after), I am come to establish it in its fullness, in spite of all the glosses of men; I am come to declare the true and full import of every part of it; to show the length and breadth, the entire extent, of every commandment contained therein, and the height and depth, the inconceivable purity and spirituality of it in all its branches.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.15}

Rev. W. A. Jarrel (Baptist), in “Old Testament Ethics Vindicated,” pp. 25-27, speaks as follows concerning the law of God:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.16}

“The divine will must be what the divine nature is. That the will must be what the nature is, is one of the fundamental truths of all true moral philosophy.... While the law is not the nature of God, it is the effect and likeness of that nature; it is the perfect reflection of his infinite holiness and wisdom. It must, therefore, be as unchangeable as the infinite holiness of the divine nature. Law is the positive enactment of this nature; it is the expression of God’s will.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.17}

“Law, then, being the expression of the holiness of the immutable, divine nature, it can never be relaxed or changed. As God’s nature must forever will only moral right, his law can never be other than the expression of moral right.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.18}

This will suffice for quotations from religious authors. These quotations show that the idea here presented are no new thing, so that no one need fear to accept them, lest he should be straying from the old paths. They help to confirm the argument that the ten commandments are the “old paths,” into which God calls all men to turn their steps. They are the way of holiness, the eternal way of peace; and human tongue or human pen can never adequately express their purity and their unchanging nature. E. J. W. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.19}

**“Something about Writing” The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is an age when people read; and when everybody reads, somebody must of necessity write. Moreover, if those who read are benefited by their reading, it must be because those who write have written something worth reading, and have written so plainly that the meaning cannot be misunderstood. Now, since reading from which no benefit is gained is a waste of time, it follows that a great responsibility rests upon all who write. We therefore give a few practical hints for the benefit of those who feel it to be their duty to write, but do not know just how to do so to the best advantage. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.20}

The first thing necessary, if one would write, is to have something to say. Not only should you have something which you think is worth telling, but you must be fully persuaded that it is very necessary that others should know it. You may be mistaken in your convictions, but that is another matter; the point is, if you wish others to be impressed by what you write, you must yourself first be impressed by it. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.21}

Have your subject well in hand before you begin to write. Do not take your pen, dip it in the ink, and then wait for the ideas to come and arrange themselves in the proper order. Thoughts are not so obedient as to do that. They will not arrange themselves; you must do it. Before you begin to write, take a pencil and paper, and jot down the various points which you wish to make, the texts which you wish to use, etc. Then arrange them, and your work is half done. As you write, you can alter your plan, adding or omitting thoughts as seems best. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.22}

Express yourself in the simplest and most direct manner possible. The object of language is to convey thought; therefore the more plainly this thought is expressed, the better is the language. Most younger writers do not seem to understand this, and some writers never learn it. Aim to write so plainly that people not only *may* understand, but that they *must* understand. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.23}

Do not try to be grand, or to soar. In short, do not try to force yourself to write in some particular style. If you do, your lameness will be apparent. There are writers whose eloquent passages and well-rounded periods are a constant delight. You may write as they do, if it is natural for you to do so. But do not sacrifice strength for beauty. A thing may be very pretty, and yet be utterly useless. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.24}

Of course this means you must not imitate any one style of expression. Be yourself. There is no more reason why you should imitate another’s style of writing than there is that you should imitate his manner of conversation. Saul’s armor was no doubt first class in every respect, but David could not fight in it. Because your neighbor’s coat fits him well, you must not conclude that it will also become you. Your coat may be of an entirely different size and pattern, and yet it may fit you as well as it fits him. So words which are very impressive when uttered by one, may be commonplace when spoken by another. It is just as necessary that the style of expression should fit the individual as it is that his coat should fit him. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.25}

Above all, don’t plagiarize. This is a word which has much the same meaning as embezzlement, defalcation, etc. In plain English, it means stealing. And don’t steal. If somebody has written something which you think is good, don’t try to get the credit of it by signing your name to it. If you quote it, give the author the credit. If you do not know the author’s name, or do not wish to give it, at least indicate that the quoted passage is not your own. This is the honest way. To do any other way is to be dishonest. The law does not punish a man for appropriating an article that has been written by another, unless the article has been copyrighted; but such an act is no less desirable on that account. “Thou shalt not steal.” {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 135.26}

Besides the sin of plagiarism, there is another thing about it to be considered, and that is the loss of reputation which it brings. A man steals money because he has none, and does not like to work. It is very natural to imagine that people steal ideas for the same reason. If your ideas are your own, and are expressed in your own style, they may be somewhat crude, but you will get credit for just what you are. But if you take the ideas and expressions of another and pass them off as her own, people will not give you credit for being able to produce anything yourself. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.1}

Of course it is understood that there is very little absolute originality. We are all mutually dependent. We know nothing that we have not learned; and we have learned somebody new before we did. But we may have combinations of ideas that no one else has, and we may be able to express ideas in a way that has occurred to no one else. This is originality, in the common acceptation of the term. If one has not this originality, if he cannot say anything that has not already been said, there is no occasion for him to write. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.2}

Don’t attempt to write poetry if you can possibly keep from it. This rule should be written in capital letters, and kept constantly before every young writer. Hundreds of persons who might have been useful, have resigned themselves by starting in with poetry. Many people seem to think that poetry is the simplest and most natural kind of composition. This is a grave error. Composition is not necessarily poetry because each line begins with a capital letter; neither can all rhyme be called poetry. There are not so many poets in the world by a great many thousand as is sometimes supposed. Don’t imagine that you are one of the few, just because you enjoy reading poetry. But if your thoughts will present themselves in rhyme and meter, and you cannot possibly express herself except in verse, then go ahead. The result may be poetry, and it may not be; but it is more likely to be poetry than is a great part of the matter which is called by that name. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.3}

Finally, if you wish your manuscript to receive speedy attention from any editor, observe the following simple items:- {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.4}

Write on ruled paper. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.5}

Write only on one side of the sheet. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.6}

Use pen and ink. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.7}

Write as legibly as you possibly can. Don’t “dash off” your thoughts, and then ask the editor to excuse poor writing, as you were in a hurry. The chances are that if you were in too great a hurry to write legibly, the editor will be in too great a hurry to attempt to read what you have written. Many valuable thoughts have perished in the wastebasket because of a failure to observe this last rule. Remember that to write poorly is solely the editor’s prerogative. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.8}

These are by no means all the important points that might be noted; yet if only these are kept in mind, and you write, not for fame, nor for any selfish motive, but with the simple purpose to do good, you will be quite likely to write something worth reading. E. J. W. {SITI March 4, 1886, p. 136.9}

**“A Question Concerning the Sanctuary” The Signs of the Times, 12, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

A brother sends a letter of inquiries, in which we find the following:- {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.1}

“In reference to the priests taking the blood of the victim into the sanctuary, it seems to me that in case it was for the sin of a priest or of the whole congregation, then the blood was taken into the first room [the holy place]; but if it was for a ruler or one of the common people, the work was all done in the court, by the altar of burnt offering. And if this is true, how were the sins of *these* lodged in the sanctuary? From Leviticus 10:17, I gather that the priests, by eating of this sin offerings whose blood was not taken into the sanctuary, *bore the iniquity* of the people.” {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.2}

The brother is partly right and partly wrong in his conclusions. It is true that the blood of some sin offerings was taken into the holy place, and that the blood of others was not. When the blood was taken into the sanctuary, the body of the victim was burnt without the camp. See Leviticus 4:1-26; 6:30. But when the blood of the offering was not taken into the sanctuary, its flesh was taken by the priests into the holy place, and was there eaten by them. See Leviticus 6:24, 25. Thus the sin was figuratively taken within the sanctuary,-in one case by the blood, and in the other by the flesh. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.3}

The wrong part of the conclusion was in supposing that in the latter case the priests themselves bore the iniquity of the people. Leviticus 10:16-18 reads as follows:- {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.4}

“And Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin offering, and, behold, it was burnt; and he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron which were left alive, saying, Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord? Behold, the blood of it was not brought in within the holy place; ye should indeed have eaten it in the holy place, as I commanded.” {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.5}

A careful reading of the above, especially verse 17, plainly shows that *the flesh* of the sin offering, and *not* the priests, was to bear the iniquity of the congregation. What did Moses say God had given to the priests? The flesh. For what purpose had he given it? To bear the iniquity of the congregation. The construction of the sentence absolutely forbids the conclusion that the priests bore the iniquity. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.6}

The victim represent Christ. He “bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” 1 Peter 2:24. “The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” Isaiah 53:6. In his own person he took them into the true sanctuary in Heaven. And as the lamb or goat typified Christ, the sins that were confessed over it were laid upon it as a whole, so that they might be conveyed into the sanctuary either by the flesh or by the blood. The animal was innocent, and might therefore be a type of Christ; but the priest was a sinful, mortal man, and could not therefore himself represent Christ in the act of bearing our sins. We design erelong to give this subject a more extended consideration in the SIGNS. E. J. W. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.7}

**“The Foundation of God’s Government” The Signs of the Times, 12, 10.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is one more argument that we would introduce right here. To do so, we shall have to refer to the tabernacle built by Moses, and we shall try to do so as briefly as is consistent with perfect clearness. In general, only references will be given; the reader can look them up at his leisure. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.8}

In Exodus 25:8 we read these words: “And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.” These words of the Lord follow a command to Moses to receive offerings of gold, silver, brass, acacia wood, fine linen, goat’s hair, etc. Of these the tabernacle was to be built. Chapters 25-30 contain the complete description of this structure, together with all the furniture and vessels connected with it. The framework was composed of boards standing upright. There were twenty on each side, and eight on the west end. These boards were ten cubits fifteen feet long, and a cubit and a half wide, and were entirely covered with gold; each one had at the lower extremity two tenons, which were inserted into the sockets of silver, and this arrangement, together with bars that ran through rings on the sides of the boards, served to keep them in position. Exodus 26:15-30. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.9}

The east end was closed by a vail, or hanging, of fine linen of various colors, with figures of cherubim worked on it. This was called the door of the tabernacle. Exodus 26:36, 37. Four curtains, made respectively of linen, goat’s hair, rams’ skins, and badgers’ skins, formed the covering of the tabernacle. Exodus 26:1-14. Besides the door, there was a second vail of the same material, which divided the tabernacle into two rooms; the first was called the “holy place,” and the second the “most holy place.” Exodus 26:31-33; Hebrews 9:1-3. So much for the tabernacle itself. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.10}

Within this tabernacle were various articles of furniture. Just within the holy place on the north side, was a table, upon which show-bread was placed. Exodus 26:23-35; 40:22, 23. On the south side there was a candlestick, or lamp-stand, having seven lamps, the whole beaten out of one solid piece of gold. These lamps were to be kept continually burning. Exodus 25:31, 39. In the western extremity of the holy place, just before the second vail, was the golden altar of incense. Upon this the priest offered incense night and morning. Exodus 30:1-9. This is all that was in the holy place. In the most holy place there was but one article of furniture, the ark of the testimony (Exodus 25:10-22), and that is of so much importance in our investigation that we shall examine it more particularly. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.11}

By a careful examination of the scripture last referred to, we find that this ark was an oblong box of acacia wood, covered within and without with gold. On its sides were rings of gold, through which staves were passed for use in carrying it, so that it need never be touched by human hands. The cover to this ark was called the mercy-seat, and was of solid gold. Upon the mercy-seat were the cherubim, one on each end, of solid gold, and of the same piece as the mercy-seat itself. The wings of these cherubim were extended so as to form an arch over the ark, and their faces looked toward each other, and downward to the ark. Within the ark was the “testimony” (Exodus 25:16), which was nothing other than the ten commandments which God spoke from Sinai, wrote on tables of stone, and delivered to Moses for safe deposit in the ark. Deuteronomy 10:1-5. This ark, as stated before, was in the most holy place (Hebrews 9:3-5), into which no man could enter save the high priest, and he only once a year. Hebrews 9:7. Even then he did not see the ark, because the cloud of incense arising from the censer which he held in his hand, entirely concealed it. Leviticus 16:12, 13. Without this precaution, he would have died, and the reason why will presently appear. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.12}

Turning to Exodus 25:20-22, we read: “And the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubims be. And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel.” Now we know why no one except the high priest could enter the most holy place, and why even he, in his yearly visit, could not behold the mercy-seat and live. It was because the glory of God was there. In that place the priest was in the immediate presence of God. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.13}

It is now time to inquire how Moses, after having been commanded to build the sanctuary, happened to light upon the special style that he did. For an answer, read Exodus 25:9, 40. “According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it.” “And look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount.” Since it was to be God’s house, God himself furnished the plan. But by reading a little more, we shall find that this pattern was not something then for the first time conceived. In the 9th of Hebrews, Paul, after telling that Moses purified (in a figure) the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, by sprinkling them with the blood of animals, says, verse 23: “It was therefore necessary that *the patterns of things in the Heavens* should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.” This tells us plainly that the tabernacle and its furniture were copied after things in the Heavens. Now read Hebrews 8:1, 2: “Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens; a minister of *the* sanctuary, and of *the true tabernacle*, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.14}

Now we know that the tabernacle built by Moses as a dwelling-place for God, was only a temporary representation of God’s real, permanent dwelling-place in Heaven. That God does have a tangible structure in Heaven for his occupancy, where, to use a common expression, he holds court, is evident from the scriptures just quoted, and also from Psalm 11:4: “The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in Heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men.” This temple, the place of God’s throne, has been seen in Heaven. John says: “And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament.” Revelation 11:19. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.15}

If we should ask what portion of the earthly tabernacle especially represented God’s throne, the reader would almost at once answer: “The ark, with the cherubim on the mercy-seat above; because it was between these cherubim that his glory was manifested.” This would be correct. God’s actual dwelling-place is between the cherubim; when he moves from place to place, his throne (a living throne) and the cherubim accompany him. For proof of this read the following texts:- {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.16}

“Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth.” Psalm 80:1. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 151.17}

“The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; he sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth be moved.” Psalm 90:1. Besides these, read Ezekiel 1 and 10; Isaiah 6:1-3, and Ezekiel 28:14. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 152.1}

Remember now that everything in the earthly sanctuary was a representation of some corresponding thing in the heavenly sanctuary, as nearly exact as human hands could approach to a likeness of things not made with hands, and we shall of necessity conclude that the throne of God in Heaven is directly above the original law of ten commandments, of which the tables placed in the ark by Moses were only a copy. In other words, the ten commandments form the foundation of God’s throne. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 152.2}

In further pursuit of this thought, read Psalm 80:14: “Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face.” Also the following: “The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation [establishment] of his throne.” Psalm 97:1, 2. We have already learned that the law is holy, just, and good, and that it is righteousness; it is perfect righteousness, and there is no righteousness outside of this law of ten commandments. Therefore when the psalmist says that righteousness is the establishment of God’s throne, it is equivalent to saying that God’s throne is established upon the ten commandments; that the ten commandments literally form the basis, or foundation, of the throne of God. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 152.3}

This term “throne” is often applied to sovereign authority or royal dignity. The ruler of a country is the representative of that government, and by metonymy the place where the ruler dispenses justice is put for the ruler, and so for the government. We speak of “the throne of the universe,” meaning thereby the government of the universe. So, then, the fact that the ten commandments are the foundation of God’s throne, shows that they are the rule of his Government; that every act is in accordance with their just sanctions; and that all the creatures of his Government throughout the universe are required to obey them. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 152.4}

This is a conclusion which we are confident cannot be overthrown, nor can any one who holds himself to a strict regard for the plain word of God, contradict it. This being so, what a view it gives us of the perpetuity of God’s law! Leaving the eternity that is past, we look forward and ask, How long shall God’s moral law endure? And the answer comes, It will endure just as long as God’s throne endures, just as long as God rules the universe; for God’s throne could not remain firm if its foundations were destroyed. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 152.5}

And this shows the unchanging nature of the law, as well as its perpetuity. The moral law is composed of ten precepts. Since the law is the foundation of God’s throne, we may with propriety call the ten precepts the ten stones composing the foundation. Indeed, Bishop E. O. Haven, of the M. E. Church, seemed to have a similar idea in his mind, when he wrote the little book, entitled, “The Pillars of Truth.” This work contains ten chapters, each chapter being the substance of a lecture before the students of Michigan University, the subject of the lectures being the ten commandments. These commandments, according to the bishop’s idea, are the ten pillars that uphold all truth. This being true, how can one of them be exchanged for another? What would support the throne of the universe while the transfer was being made? Such a question needs no answer. When we realize the relation which the moral law sustains to God and his Government, the mind at once sees the absurdity of the idea that one jot or one tittle can pass from the law, or that the slightest change could ever be made in it. We must exclaim with the psalmist: “Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever.” Psalm 119:160. E. J. W. {SITI March 11, 1886, p. 152.6}

**“Doers of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

In previous articles we have laid down some of the fundamental principles of the law. We have found that the moral law of ten commandments, spoken from Sinai, is perfect, holy, and good; that it is the instrument which enables us to judge between good and evil; that it is “the righteousness of God,” so that there is no goodness or morality to be found outside of it; that it is also called “the way,” “the way of peace,” “the truth,” “the testimony,” the “word of the Lord,” etc., and that it is the expression of God’s will; that the transgression of it is sin, which makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached, so that whoever admits the existence of sin, and the necessity for the preaching of the gospel, virtually testifies to the existence of the law; more than this, we have learned that, as the righteousness of God, it is the foundation of his throne, the basis of his government of the universe, and that it was therefore in full force before this world was brought into existence, and that it will continue in force as long as God’s throne endures, the delight of all the redeemed, throughout eternity. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.1}

These points must be borne in mind as we proceed to their application in the examination of special texts. In this examination the points mentioned above will be strengthened, if it is possible to strengthen a position already so strong. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.2}

We have already quoted Romans 2:13: “For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.” This statement of the apostle is unqualified, and admits of no qualification. The doers of the law shall be justified. The statement is positive and emphatic. There can be no qualification nor exception. Think a moment. It is the righteousness of God, the perfection of holiness. Must not the keeping of it, then, as Solomon says, be “the whole duty of man”? And if a man does his whole duty, and is a partaker of the righteousness of God, can he be condemned? Not by any means. God himself has declared, through his inspired apostle, that “the doer of the law shall be justified.” Wherever in the universe a being is found who is a doer of the law, he is just in the sight of God. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.3}

Already I hear some one exclaim, “He thinks that man can save himself by his own works, and leaves no room for Christ.” Not so fast; do not pass judgment upon a piece of work until it is completed. Perhaps the proposition will seem clearer if we consider what constitutes one a “doer of the law.” Let us illustrate: A father goes from home, leaving his son a certain amount of work to perform. There is a portion of work for each hour,-enough to keep the son constantly employed. Suppose that the son works faithfully for an hour or two, and then consumes the remainder of the time in play; has he done what his father commanded? Certainly not. But suppose that he works faithfully every hour but one, and leaves the work allotted to that hour unperformed; can he now be called a doer of his father’s will? He evidently cannot. Unless he can truthfully say, “I have done what my father left for me to do,” he cannot be called a doer of his father’s will; and he cannot truthfully say that he has done what his father gave him to do, unless he has done all that was enjoined upon him. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.4}

This is more than a simple illustration; it is a plain statement of fact. The boy cannot be said to have done what his father told him to do, if he has not done it all; a man cannot be said to have traveled the road from one point to another, if he lacks a mile of it; even so no man can be called a “doer of the law” of God if he has ever violated one of its precepts. If there be a man who has kept every commandment but one, and has violated that one but a single time, he cannot be called a doer of the law, and hence cannot be justified by the law. He would be almost a doer of the law, but there is no promise of justification for those who simply almost do the law. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.5}

Right in this connection we must read the words of James: “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said [or that law which said], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.” James 2:10, 11. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.6}

Many people, in their shortsightedness, have thought that this is unjust. There is no injustice in it; it is simply a statement of what exists from the very nature of things. The apostle does not say that the man who breaks only one commandment shall be considered as guilty as he who should violate every one, although he is guilty of all. There are degrees of sin. The law is sometimes likened to a chain having ten links. Now if only one link be broken, the chain is broken, and, until that link is mended, is just as useless as though all the links were broken. So if a man breaks one commandment, he has broken the law, and it is just as impossible for the law to justify him as it would be if he had broken every precept. The following from Dr. Chalmers is direct on this point:- {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.7}

“In order that you [may] feel the force of the apostle’s demonstration, there is one principle which is held to be sound in human law, and which, in all equity, ought to be extended to the law of God. The principle is this,-that however manifold the enactments of the law may be, it is possible, by one act or one kind of disobedience, to incur the guilt of an entire defiance to the authority which framed it; and therefore to bring rightfully down upon the head of the transgressor the whole weight of the severities which it denounces against the children of iniquity. To be worthy of death, it is not necessary to commit all the things which are included in the sad enumeration of human vices, any more than it is necessary for a criminal to add depredation to forgery, or murder to both, ere a capital sentence go out against him from the administrators of the law upon which he has trampled. You may as effectually cut with a friend by one hostile or insolent expression, as if you had employed a thousand; and your disavowal of authority may be as intelligibly announced by one deed of defiance as by many; and your contempt of Heaven’s court be as strongly manifested by your willful violation of one of the commandments, as if you had thwarted every requirement.... {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.8}

“The man who has thrown off the allegiance of religion, may neither have the occasion nor the wish to commit all the offenses which it prohibits, or to utter all the blasphemies which may be vented forth in the spirit of defiance against the Almighty’s throne. And yet the principle of defiance may have taken full possession of his heart, and irreligion may be the element in which he breathes. And in every instance, when his will comes into competition with the will of God, may the creature lift himself above the Creator; and though, according to the varieties of natural temperament, these instances may be more manifold and various with one man than with another, yet that which essentially constitutes the character of moral and spiritual guilt may be of equal strength and inveteracy with both.... Ungodliness, in short, is not a thing of tale and measure; it is a thing of weight and of quality.”-*Chalmers on the Romans, Lecture VI.* {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.9}

The above is a good exposition of James 2:10, 11. We learn, then, that when a man willfully violates one commandment, it is not respect for the law, nor for the Lawgiver, that restrains him from violating all of them. He has shown his contempt for the authority that gave them, and thus becomes guilty of all. Now when we recall the fact that each one of these commandments reaches the thoughts and intents of the heart, we may have something of a sense of what it takes to be a doer of the law. If it is thought that there is even one human being who merits that title, read the following plain declarations:- {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.10}

“For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way; they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” Romans 3:9-19. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.11}

After reading the above, you will have no difficulty in understanding why the apostle immediately adds:- {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.12}

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” Romans 3:20. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.13}

It seems hardly possible that any one should now imagine that there is any disagreement between Romans 2:13 and Romans 3:20. It is a fact that all must recognize, that the law will justify all doers of it; and it is just as certain that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified, because there is no one of whom it can be said, He is a doer of the law. It is not the fault of the law that it will not justify anybody; it would do so if it were possible; it is the fault of man that it cannot. E. J. W. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 215.14}

**“Forgiveness; Real, not Figurative” The Signs of the Times, 12, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is probably no one who gives the matter any consideration, who doubts that the offerings for sin, under the Levitical law, represented the real sacrifice made by Christ; although there are very many who fail to notice that the service performed by the priests was only a type of the real service which is conducted by Christ, our great High Priest, in the true sanctuary in Heaven. The Scriptures, however, give abundant evidence of the fact that the tabernacle built in the wilderness was but a pattern of “the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man;” that the high priest was a type of Christ; and that, in short, the whole service was typical, or figurative. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 168.1}

But here some are liable to make a mistake. Many suppose that because the service of the sanctuary was only figurative, therefore the forgiveness which the sinner is said to have received was also only figurative. The fallacy of this supposition will be apparent if a comprehensive view is taken of the whole subject. It will be remembered that the figurative sanctuary service continued until Christ made the real sacrifice on the cross. Then if the supposition noted were true, it would appear that before the time of Christ no sinner had really been forgiven. But Elijah went to Heaven, and therefore his sins must certainly have been forgiven. David says: “I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.” Psalm 32:5. That is positive proof of sins actually pardoned. Therefore we must conclude that sins were pardoned *in fact,* before the time of Christ. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 168.2}

“But,” asks one in astonishment, “do you think that there was any virtue in the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin?” Not at all; neither do we believe that there is any virtue in the mechanical act of baptism; yet we are commanded to be baptized as a condition of securing remission of sins. What is it that secures our forgiveness? It is the death and resurrection of Christ (Romans 4:25); it is not by the mere act of baptism, but by the faith which is thereby indicated, that we secure pardon for transgressions. So in the case of the man in the Levitical age. He was forgiven, not through any virtue in the blood of the goat or bullock which he offered, but by virtue of his faith in Christ’s sacrifice, which he manifested by offering an animal that typified Christ. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 168.3}

We must not lose sight of the fact that the plan of salvation has not varied in the least since the days of Adam. When man first sinned; then Christ was given as a ransom. It was then that Christ voluntarily offered to die in man’s stead; it was then that God’s love to the world led him to consent to deliver up his only begotten son; it was then that the promise of life through Christ was made to the human race. Now a *promise* on the part of God is just as sure as a thing that is actually performed; for he cannot lie. And for this reason it is that Christ is said to have been “slain from the foundation of the world.” It made no difference that the death was not accomplished until four thousand years after the fall; from the time the promise was made, forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ was just as certain to the man who repented as it is to-day. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 168.4}

Notice the exact parallel between the case of men in the days before Christ and that of those after Christ. They had ceremonies by which they manifested their faith in Christ; and because of this faith they were forgiven. We have ceremonies (as baptism and the Lord’s Supper) by which we manifest our faith in Christ; and because of our faith we obtain the forgiveness of our sins. They looked forward by faith to the time when Christ, according to the promise, should be offered; we look backward to the cross and we see the promise actually fulfilled. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 168.5}

But while their sins were forgiven in fact, they were blotted out only in figure. Even in this the parallel holds good; for the sins of men now living, although forgiven, have not yet been blotted out. The exhortation to us is, “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” Acts 3:19. And because the way of salvation is uniform throughout, and God deals with men in the same way in all ages of the world, we do not like the terms “old dispensation” and “new dispensation;” or “Jewish dispensation” and “gospel dispensation.” Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, lived in the “gospel age” as well as we. See Galatians 3:8. The gospel is the good news of salvation through Christ, and the patriarchs understood that as well as we do. Forgiveness of sins has always been granted immediately upon repentance; and Christ’s blood was of just as much efficacy four thousand years ago as it is to-day. “Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” Acts 4:12. E. J. W. {SITI March 18, 1886, p. 168.6}

**“Unleavened Bread at Communion” The Signs of the Times, 12, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

QUESTION.-“What kind of bread should be used in a celebration of the Lord’s Supper? Some say that unleavened bread alone should be used; others argue for leavened bread; and still others say that it makes no difference. Which is right? G. C. I.” {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.1}

ANSWER.-To answer categorically, we should say that only unleavened should be used in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. The reasons for this answer are as follows:- {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.2}

1. By using the bread we follow the example of Christ. The Lord’s Supper was instituted by Christ in connection with the last Passover (Matthew 26:17-30), and it is certain that only unleavened bread was used on that occasion; because during the whole of the Passover week, no particle of leaven was allowed in the Jewish dwelling. The law on this point was very restrict. See Exodus 12:18-20. This may be said to be only negative testimony; but it is more than can be produced in favor of leavened bread. If in the absence of positive command, we follow the example of Christ, we certainly cannot go wrong. But this is not all that we have. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.3}

2. The Lord’s Supper is designed to represent the death of Christ. See 1 Corinthians 11:26. It is a memorial of that which was foreshadowed by the Passover and by all the sacrifices of the old ceremonial law. There is, therefore, the same reason for using unleavened bread in the Lord’s Supper that there was for using it in the passover. When Christ broke the bread, he said: “This is my body, which is broken for you.” 1 Corinthians 11:14. since the bread of the communion represents Christ’s body, it must be without blemish, or else it is not a fit symbol; for Peter says: “Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.” 1 Peter 1:18, 19. Now leaven is a fermentation, and fermentation is decomposition and decay. Then certainly leavened bread cannot officially represent the spotless body of Christ, any more than leavened or fermented wine can properly represent his precious blood. Therefore we hold that it was no accident which led to the use of unleavened bread at the institution of the Lord’s Supper. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.4}

3. This conclusion is verified by Exodus 23:18, which reads thus: “Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread.” This is a positive commandment, and leaves us no choice in the matter. It cannot be said that this applies only to the sacrifices under the old ceremonial law; for they were no more the blood of the Lord’s sacrifice than is the cup of the Lord’s Supper. Indeed, the Bible speaks more plainly of this than it does of those; for Christ himself said, when he took the cup: “*This is my blood* of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” Matthew 26:28. It is plain enough that Exodus 23:18 does not refer to the literal blood of Christ; for no man ever offered, or could offer that with anything; and it is equally plain that it does not refer to anything that was or used to represent Christ’s blood, whether before or after his death. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.5}

In view of the reasons here given, and especially of the explicit commandment in Exodus 23:18, we think we are justified in saying not only that it is right to use unleavened bread at communion, but that it is wrong to use any other. It may seem to some a trifling matter, but nothing can be a trifling matter upon which the Lord has seen fit to give the commandment. E. J. W. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.6}

**“Justified by Faith” The Signs of the Times, 12, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

Before going further, let us have some definitions to keep in our mind. *Justification* is “a showing to be just, or conformable to law, rectitude, or propriety.” *Condemnation* is “the judicial act of declaring guilty, and dooming to punishment.” The two words are directly opposite in meaning; and we have the inspired declaration that all the world are guilty (condemned) before God, and that by the deeds of the law none can be justified. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.7}

That there may be no possibility of a mistake, we will compare Romans 2:13 and 3:20 a little further. Both are true, but they do not both apply to the same classes. The first is a universal truth. The *doers* of the law, wherever or whenever they are found, are justified. It cannot be otherwise. But in this world there are no doers of the law. There may be many who are trying to do it; but whatever degree of success they may have, they cannot be called *doers* of the law, for they have repeatedly broken it. Suppose now that it were possible for a man to turn squarely around and keep the law perfectly, would he be justified? By no means. The law requires that *all there is of us* shall be devoted to it *all the time*. Then if a man gets behind, he can never catch up. Since all our strength is required for each hour, it is plain that the perfect performance of duty during any hour will not in the least degree make up for the non-performance of duty during any other hour. There can be no such thing as works of supererogation. While the law justifies us in the performance of good deeds, it cannot, as a matter of fact, justify us for a single moment, no matter how good our present actions may be, since on its very first application to us, it must detect the past sin, and consequently must at once condemn us. Justification and condemnation have reference to our whole lives; and since, however good we may be, for a portion of our lives, at the end, it will be seen that we have not done *all* our duty, we must therefore stand condemned. The law is just and good, and therefore it can never declare a guilty man innocent. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.8}

Is there, then, no hope for any? Since all have sinned, must all receive the wages-death? Will the law with its unrelenting grasp forever hold all the world in the bondage of death? Such would be the case, and there would be no hope for any, had not “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” John 3:16. All the world are guilty before God, because all have sinned; but they may be “justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” Romans 3:24. There is “hope in the Lord; for with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption.” Psalm 130:7. Let us read Paul’s brief but wonderfully clear statement of how we may be justified:- {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.9}

“Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” Romans 3:24-26. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.10}

Take notice that this is not indulgence for sin, nor remission of the law, but *remission of sins*. The sins are remitted-sent away. By this process, the sins are taken from the individual, so that he may be counted as though he had never committed them. Note also the fact that it is by the grace of God that we are justified, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. There is no antagonism between the Father and the Son; both are concerned in the great work of man’s redemption. The death of Christ, inasmuch as the Lord “laid upon him the iniquity of us all” (Isaiah 53:6), made it possible for God to justify those who have faith in his blood. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.11}

“To declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.” Christ’s righteousness was perfect. He delighted to do the will of God, because the law-God’s will-was within his heart. Psalm 40:8. He “did no sin, neither was guilt found in his mouth.” 1 Peter 2:22. He alone, of all the people who ever trod this earth, could challenge even his enemies to find in his life one trace of sin. John 8:46. We have learned that righteousness is obedience to the law. Now it is because of unrighteousness-disobedience to the law-that man is condemned. If by any means a man’s whole life could be made to appear in perfect harmony with the law, it is evident that that man would be justified. It is also evident that if the sins of his life could be removed, his life would appear in harmony with the law of God. Now this is just what is done. Christ’s righteousness is declared for the remission-taking away-of those sins. As Christ’s life is worth infinitely more than the lives of all the world, so through his death his righteousness may be made to take the place of the disobedience of all those who will have faith in him. We may say that an exchange is made; Christ takes upon himself the sins of all our past life, and in return lets his righteousness be counted as ours. When this is done for a man, the law can do no other than justify him. It demands perfect obedience in the life, and that is what it finds. It matters not to the law that the obedience which it finds in the man’s life is not really his own; it is counted as his own; and since the obedience is perfect, the law cannot condemn. Christ suffered the penalty for the sins which the man actually committed (Isaiah 53:6, 10; 2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 Peter 2:24), and thus God can be perfectly just and at the same time may justify a man who has sinned. But this can be done only for those who have faith in Christ’s blood. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.12}

It must not be forgotten that we are now speaking only of the sins that are *past*. It is impossible that *remission* of sins could have reference to anything else, for that which does not exist cannot be taken away; and to justify a man for sins not yet committed, in other words, to grant indulgence for sins, would throw contempt on the law, and bring in anarchy and ruin. And no sins are remitted, except of those who believe in Jesus. If any are Christ’s, they are Abraham’s seed (Galatians 3:29), and therefore, with him, their faith is imputed unto them for righteousness. James 2:23. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 183.13}

“Therefore,” says Paul, “we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” Romans 3:28. This does not mean that the law is ignored, and that a man who disregards the law can be justified. Nothing of the kind. There could be no justification in such a case; for justification has no connection with injustice, and to clear a guilty man-a violator of the law-is an act of injustice. The Lord says that he “will not at all acquit the wicked” (Nahum 1:3), and he does not; for the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin (1 John 1:7), and when this is applied to an individual, as it is to all who have faith in it, it frees him from guilt, and then he must necessarily stand justified. But the man could not be justified if the law were left out of the account; for justification, as we have already learned, is “a showing to be just or conformable to law.” {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.1}

But this will not be done for a man who does not acknowledge the justice of the law which condemns his sins, and, repeating of them, promise obedience to the law. No just governor would pardon a man under any other circumstances. Here is a man who has been convicted of theft; he petitions for a pardon, but unless he promises to reform, he will not be likely to get it. If he persists that he has a right to steal, and has no intention of reforming, nothing can secure his pardon. Of course this is not a perfect parallel to the sinner pleading with God for forgiveness; for when a man receives pardon from an earthly ruler, his guilt remains the same as ever; but when he receives a pardon from God, the same blood which secures the pardon, takes away the sin. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.2}

The statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law, is only a summing up of Paul’s argument, which we have already given. No amount of work will have the slightest effect in securing justification by the remission of past sins. That which is done, we cannot undo. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.3}

Nothing that we can do can alter the fact that we have sinned. Your past life has been full of sin, and you want to become free from the guilt of it; what can you do? Though you were able to keep the law without the slightest deviation, that would not remove a single sin. You can do nothing but “believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.” He says: “Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden [with sin], and I will give you rest.” Matthew 11:28. The blood of Jesus Christ, and that alone, can cleanse from sin. So we conclude, with Paul, that “a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law.” {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.4}

We have said that no work of ours, however perfect it may be, can atone for past transgressions; that even though we should be able to turn around and keep the law perfectly, that would not remove a single sin. As a matter of fact, however, it is impossible for the sinner to do any good work, even though it would be counted in his justification. “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Romans 8:7. “The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that *ye cannot do the things that ye would*.” Galatians 5:17. This means, of course, while we are serving the flesh, and out of Christ; for Christ says: “Without me ye can do nothing.” John 15:5. This was said to those whose sins had been forgiven, and will certainly apply, with all its force, to those who have never known Christ. Christ says that “out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.” Matthew 15:19. These are the works of the flesh (see the complete list in Galatians 5:19-21), and are what men do by nature. Men may have good desires, but they cannot do what they would. Galatians 5:17. The law of God is so extensive and perfect in its requirements that the best efforts of fallen man, unassisted, must fall far short of it. And this thought makes us understand still more clearly the statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law; for every act that the man performs before he comes to Christ, no matter how good his intentions may be, only sinks him the deeper in condemnation. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.5}

*“Not all our groans and tears,  
Nor works which we have done,  
Nor vows, nor promises, nor prayers,  
Can e’er for sin atone.  
“Relief alone is found  
In Jesus’ precious blood;  
‘Tis this that heals the mortal wound  
And reconciles to God.” {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.6}*

And so the sinner, appalled at the multitude of his sins, which like a mountain upon his back well-nigh sink him into despair, having lost all confidence in himself, may sing:- {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.7}

*“Just as I am,-without one plea,  
But that thy blood was shed for me,  
And that thou bid’st me come to thee,  
O, Lamb of God, I come.  
“Just as I am-and waiting not  
To rid my soul of one dark blot,  
To thee, whose blood can cleanse each spot,  
O, Lamb of God, I come.” E. J. W. {SITI March 25, 1886, p. 184.8}*