**“Obedience Past and Present” The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have a letter from a lady in Alabama who is very much interested in the work of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES and the *American Sentinel*, and who is doing good work in distributing them among her friends. She writes a very kind and appreciative letter, and asks several pertinent questions, stating, what may readily be seen from the tone of the letter, that she is standing for truth and it open for conviction. The questions which she asks will receive due attention, but before answering them we wish to set our correspondent right upon other points which she incidentally mentions in her letter. We quote a paragraph:- {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.40}

“I believe that Christ was the end of the law of Moses. He was the fulfillment of the law. Moses’ law was only emblematic. While they kept it, it was imputed to them for righteousness. When Christ came he gave the same law only in a spiritual sense. It was to be written upon our hearts. The Jews kept the form of the law, while they were a cruel, wicked, and vindictive people.” {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.41}

It is evident that our correspondent has in mind the law of ten commandments when she speaks of the law of Moses being emblematic. We have no fault to find with the expression “law of Moses” with reference to the moral law, for it is sometimes so used in the Bible, although that title is not distinctive. As to its being emblematic, the writer herself furnishes proof that it was not, by saying that Christ gave the same law. A thing cannot be emblematic of itself; but it is true that the law that Christ taught in the sermon on the mount is the same law that the Jews were taught, and it is also true that Christ was the author of it in the beginning. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.42}

The idea of the writer is evidently, as shown by the last expression, “The Jews kept the form of the law,” that the Jews had simply an outward religion, while Christ taught spirituality; that the Jews had the form of the law, while Christ taught the same law in reality. But Christ in his sermon on the mount did not give anything new concerning the commandments, not even concerning the sixth and seventh. He did not teach whereas they had been informed that it was wrong to kill, he would not give them another and better commandment. Not by any means. He simply showed those people who had lost sight of the true religion that the sixth commandment does not simply forbid the taking of human life, but it forbids evil thoughts. This it did from the beginning. When the commandment was spoken from Sinai, it comprehended just as much as it does to-day. So with the whole law. Paul says in Romans 7:14 that “the law is spiritual.” This is true of the whole law, and was true of the whole law from the beginning. The law was never satisfied with anything short of spirituality. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.43}

Now it is true that many of the Jews, perhaps the majority, kept the law only in appearance. But that does not prove that there were some among the people in that day who knew the extent and depth of the law, and that it required spiritual obedience, any more than the same thing is proved by the fact that the great majority of the people in these days have only an outward morality which is not real godliness. God makes no greater demand upon us than he did upon his people anciently. It is no more true now than it was in the days of Moses that love is the fulfilling of the law; neither is it any more true to-day than then that God designed that the law should be enshrined in the heart to be the spring of every act and thought. This is shown by the following scripture:- {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.44}

In Deuteronomy 6:5, 6 Moses addressed the people on behalf of God as follows: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart.” In Deuteronomy 20:6 Moses says: “And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and that thou mayest live.” The psalmist David in all his writings shows a clear perception of the spirituality of the law, and the extent of its requirements. In Psalm 37:31 he speaks thus of the righteous man: “The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide;” and in the eleventh verse of the one hundred and nineteenth psalm he says, “Thy word have I his in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee.” {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.45}

Many other texts might be cited to show that heart religion,-that is, a religion not of form, but of fact; a religion taking hold of the very life and character, and every thought,-was known to the conscientious Jews to be what God required, and that there were those who had experience in just such religion. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.46}

Again, our friend says that “while they kept the law it was imputed to them for righteousness.” This is a slight mistake. Moses, in Deuteronomy 7:20, says, “It shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us.” If they kept the law, that was their righteousness.But imputed righteousness is a different thing. The Scripture says that “Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.” That is, the righteousness of God was counted to Abraham as his own, because he had faith in God. This is the way in which the ancient worthies were accounted righteous. Paul, in the book of Hebrews, says that Abel by his faith obtained witness that he was righteous, that Noah became heir of the righteousness which is by faith, and, finally, that all the worthies “through faith wrought righteousness.” Righteousness was imputed to them, the same as to us, by faith in Christ. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.47}

And this is the meaning of Paul’s language in Romans 10:4, which our friend quoted, that “Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” The law is so pure, its standard so high, its requirements so great, that no man has the power to fulfill it; but Christ has the law dwelling in him in that he is the author of it. It proceeds from him; he is righteousness; he is the truth and the way; and to those who have implicit faith in him, he becomes righteousness and truth. In other words, men can obtain in Christ, through faith, the very same righteousness which the law requires, but which, because of the weakness of their flesh, they cannot derive from the law itself. The Author of the law, in whom grace as well as truth dwells, can impart to them the righteousness which the law demands; and thus the object of the law is obtained, namely, the formation of a perfect character, and finally the inheritance of everlasting life, to which the law was ordained. See Romans 7:10. The reason why so many of the Jews failed to obtain righteousness was because they failed to seek if by faith. The “obedience of faith” is the only obedience that God could accept since the fall of Adam. E. J. W. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.48}

 **“The Puritan Idea” The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Dr. Herrick Johnson’s address on “Sunday Newspapers,” which has been circulated widely as a campaign document by the abettors of religious legislation, occurred the words, “Oh, for a breath of the old Puritan,” meaning that what the speaker wanted was a return to Puritan habits and customs. In the recent annual meeting of the Iowa Sabbath Convention, Mr. Gault said that what was wanted in laws was a wave of Puritanism. From these and other expressions we learn that the Puritan idea of government is the model for National Reformers of whatever stripe. A few quotations from a standard work may enable those who are interested to know just what kind of government a Puritan government would be. In a late work by Professor Fisk of Harvard College, entitled, “The Beginnings of New England,” is the following in connection with the account of the exodus of the Puritans from Holland:- {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.49}

“All persons who came to Holland and led decorous lives there, were protected in their opinions and customs. By contemporary writers in other countries this eccentric behavior of the Dutch Government was treated with unspeakable scorn. All strange religions flock thither,’ says one; ‘It is a common harbor of all heresies, a cage of unclean birds,’ says another; ‘The great mingle-mangle of all religion,’ says a third. In spite of the relief from persecution, however, the Pilgrims were not fully satisfied with their new home. The expiration of the truce with Spain might prove that this relief was only temporary, and, at any rate, complete toleration did not fill the measure of their wants. Had they come to Holland as scattered bands of refugees, they might have been absorbed into the Dutch population, as Huguenot refugees have been absorbed in Germany, England, and America. But they had come as an organized community, and absorption into a foreign nation was something to be dreaded. They wished to preserve their English speech and English traditions, keep up their organization, and find some favored spot where they could lay the corner-stone of a great Christian State.” {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.50}

This language is not written in any spirit of captious criticism. The author manifests a spirit of fairness, and writes in an impartial manner, simply giving historical facts. That he did not charge the Puritans with inconsistency is seen from the following, which very clearly sets forth the Puritan idea:- {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.51}

“It is worth while to inquire what were the real aims of the settlers of New England. What was the common purpose which brought these men together in their resolve to create for themselves a new home in the wilderness? This is a point concerning which there has been a great deal of popular misapprehension, and there has been no end of nonsense talked about it. It has been customary first to assume that the Puritan migration was undertaken in the interests of religious liberty, and then to upbraid the Puritans for forgetting all about religious liberty as soon as people came among them who disagreed with their opinions. But this view of the case is not supported by history. It is quite true that the Puritans were chargeable with gross intolerance, but it is not true that in this they were guilty of inconsistency. The notion that they came to New England for the purpose of establishing religious liberty, in any sense in which we should understand such a phrase, is entirely incorrect. It is neither more nor less than a bit of popular legend. If we mean by the phrase ‘religious liberty’ a state of things in which opposite or contradictory opinions on questions of religion shall exist side by side in the same community, and in which everybody shall decide for himself how far he will conform to the customary religious observances, nothing could have been farther from their thoughts. There is nothing they would have regarded with more genuine abhorrence. If they could have been forewarned by a prophetic voice of the general freedom-or, as they would have termed it, license-of thought and behavior which prevails in this country to-day, they would very likely have abandoned their enterprise in despair. The philosophic student of history often has occasion to see how God is wiser than man. In other words, he is often brought to realize how fortunate it is that the leaders in great historic events cannot foresee the remote results of the labors to which they have zealously consecrated their lives. It is part of the irony of human destiny that the end we really accomplish by striving with might and main is apt to be something quite different from the end we dreamed of as we started on our arduous labor. It was so with the Puritan settlers of New England. The religious liberty that we enjoy to-day is largely the consequence of their work, but it is a consequence that was unforeseen, while the direct and conscious aim of their labors was something that has never been realized, and probably never will be. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 43.52}

“The aim of Winthrop and his friends in coming to Massachusetts was a construction of a theocratic State which should be to Christians, under the New Testament dispensation, all that the theocracy of Moses and Joshua and Saul had been to the Jews in Old Testament days. They should be to all intents and purposes freed from the jurisdiction of the Stuart king, and so far as possible the texts of the Holy Scriptures should be their guide, both in weighty matters of general legislation, and in the shaping of the smallest details of daily life. In such a scheme there was no room for religious liberty, as we understand it. No doubt the text of the Scriptures may be interpreted in many ways, but among those men there was a substantial agreement as to the important points, and nothing could have been farther from their thoughts than to found a colony which should afford a field for new experiments in the art of right living. The State they were to found was to consist of a united body of believers; citizenship itself was to be co-extensive with church membership; and in such a State there was apparently no more room for heretics than there was in Rome or Madrid. This was the idea which drew Winthrop and is followers from England at a time when-as events were soon to show-they might have staid there and defied persecution with less trouble than it cost them to cross the ocean and found a new State.” {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.1}

The Puritans simply followed the customs of their time. Religious liberty was a thing unknown. Roman Catholicism and intolerance have been synonymous from the beginning. The Church of England was as intolerant as the Roman Church. The Puritans had not advanced far enough to perceive the error of the principle of religious intolerance, only they did not want the intolerance extended to them. They did not think that the Church of England ought to be intolerant, because they could see her errors, but, feeling sure that they themselves were right, they were equally sure that their opinions ought to prevail, and ought to be imposed upon others. In all New England, in the days of the Puritans, there was only one man who was far enough ahead to perceive that religion was a matter that rests with the individual, and not with the civil government, and that man was Roger Williams. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.2}

Although the Puritans were intolerant, and persecuted others even as they themselves were persecuted, they are not to be stigmatized as bad men. They thought they were right. They were but little removed from the darkest period of Roman superstition and oppression, and they had before them no example of perfect religious freedom. In consideration of their circumstances we can make allowance for the ideas of government which they had, and honor them for that spirit of independence which was perpetuated in their children, and which resulted in the complete religious liberty which was finally established in this country. But while we may make allowance for those men, considering their time, what allowance can be made for men who have before them the history of one hundred years of religious liberty in the United States, and who can compare its glorious work with the work of the religious despotism of the Old World. Those who in this age would institute the Puritan idea of government, must be either deplorably blind or else wickedly selfish. E. J. W. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.3}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:8-14” The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 20, February 15, 1890.)**

1. What did the first covenant have connected with it? {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.4}

2. Who performed the service in the worldly sanctuary? {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.5}

3. How often was service performed in each apartment? Hebrews 9:6, 7. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.6}

4. What was signified by this? Verse 8. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.7}

5. What was that sanctuary? Verse 9, first part. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.8}

6. How much was accomplished by the service?-*Ib*. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.9}

7. Who is our real high priest? {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.10}

8. Where does he minister? Hebrews 8:1, 2; 9:11. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.11}

9. Is it necessary that he offer something? Hebrews 8:3. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.12}

10. What does he offer? Hebrews 9:12. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.13}

11. What does his blood do for us? Verses 13, 14. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.14}

12. With what are we redeemed? 1 Peter 1:18, 19. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.15}

13. What is the blood of Christ called? Hebrews 13:20. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.16}

14. Did Christ minister as a priest while he was on earth? Hebrews 8:4; 9:8. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.17}

15. When did the first sanctuary cease to stand as a sanctuary? Matthew 23:38; 27:50, 51. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.18}

16. What secured the pardon of transgressions that were committed under the first covenant? Hebrews 9:14, 15. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.19}

17. Since Christ did not begin his priestly work of offering his own blood until after the crucifixion and ascension, how could this be? Galatians 3:17; Hebrews 6:13-18. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.20}

**NOTE**

The ordinances of divine service that were connected with the first covenant had no efficacy whatever. They could not make the comer thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience. All transgressions committed under that covenant that were pardoned, were pardoned by virtue of the second covenant, of which Christ is Mediator. Yet although Christ’s blood was not shed until hundreds of years after the first covenant was made, sins were forgiven whenever they were confessed. That covenant, as we have seen, was for the purpose of directing the minds of the people to the Abrahamic covenant, which God confirmed in Christ. Galatians 3:17. This confirmation was by an oath, in addition to the promise. These “two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie,” made the sacrifice of Christ as efficacious in the days of Abraham and Moses as it is now. This is made still more evident by the statement that these two things given to Abraham are the things which give us strong consolation. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.21}

**“What the Gospel Teaches” The Signs of the Times, 16, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

“And he said unto him, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” Mark 16:15, 16. These words were spoken by our Saviour after his resurrection, and shortly before his ascension. They are perfectly in harmony with his words recorded in Matthew 24:14, that “this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations.” There is no mistaking the extent of territory in which the gospel must be preached-nothing less than the whole world. And how long must it be preached? Read the whole of Matthew 24:14: “And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.” Then the gospel is to be preached until the end. The end here referred to is the same that is mentioned in verse 3, “The end of the world.” That this “end of the world” is in connection with the coming of the Lord, is shown by the words of the disciples in the verse last mentioned, and by the words of Christ in Matthew 13:40-43; 24:30, 31. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.22}

The fact that by divine command the gospel is to be preached in all the world until the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, proves conclusively that until the Lord comes, a necessity for its being preached will exist in all the world. This needs no further argument, for it is nowhere disputed. We will therefore turn our attention to a consideration of what the gospel is, and what creates the necessity for its being so long and so extensively preached. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.23}

The word “gospel” means, literally, “a good message;” Webster’s first definition is “glad tidings.” According to its derivation, it might be applied to any good news; but in the Bible it is used with exclusive reference to one thing; what that thing is, we may easily learn from the Bible itself. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.24}

In Luke 2:10 we find these words, addressed by the angel of the Lord to the shepherds in the field: “Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings [a gospel] of great joy, which shall be to all people.” The next verse tells what this gospel is: “For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.” Then the gospel which is to be preached to all people is the announcement of a Saviour. It is from this that Webster derives his specific definition of the gospel, as, “especially, the good news concerning Christ and his salvation.” {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.25}

But the simple heralding of Christ, without stating the nature and object of his work, would not be the preaching of the gospel. The “good news” consists in the fact that Christ the Lord is *a Saviour*. That Christ comes as a Saviour, necessarily implies that there are people to be saved, and something from which they must be saved. Turning to Matthew 1:21, we read the angel’s declaration before the birth of Christ: “And thou shall call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins.” Paul says (1 Timothy 1:15): “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.” So it is manifest that the preaching of the gospel consists in the announcement that Christ will save people from sin. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.26}

But while the gospel is the good news that Christ brings salvation from sin, it is evident that that simple announcement would not suffice to produce the desired results, viz., that men should believe and be baptized. For there are millions of people who virtually say that they are “rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing,” not knowing that they are “wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.” No matter how destitute a man may be, it would be of no use to offer him money if he were ignorant of his necessities, and perfectly satisfied with his condition. So no man can feel any interest in the gospel as a means of salvation from sin, unless he (1) knows what sin is, and (2) is convinced that he is a sinner, and (3) understands the nature and results of sin, so as to realize that it is something to be shunned. Therefore the gospel, with its announcement of salvation from sin, must also make known what sin is. This it does, as we shall see. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.27}

John, the evangelist, so called because it is he who more than anyone else dwells on the love of God and Christ in the salvation of man, defines sin. He says: “Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for *sin is the transgression of the law*.” 1 John 3:4. In harmony with this, Paul says that “where no law is, there is no transgression.” Romans 4:15. And “sin is not imputed when there is no law.” Romans 5:12. Volumes could not define sin more clearly than do these three texts. We have found out, then, (1) that “gospel” means good news; (2) that the gospel of the Bible is the good news of a Saviour-Christ the Lord (Luke 2:10, 11); (3) that Jesus saves from sin (Matthew 1:21; 1 Timothy 1:15); and (4) that “sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John 3:4. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 71.28}

So that, in short, the gospel announces the way by which man may be saved from the transgression of the law, and from the consequences of such transgression. Sin is the disease; the gospel is the remedy. And since the gospel is to be preached in all the world, until the coming of the Lord, it follows that “all the world,” yea, “every creature,” has sinned. This we read in Romans 3:23: “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 82.1}

It must also be true that sin will be in the world till the Lord comes. And this we verify by a comparison of Genesis 6:5 and 13:13 with Luke 17:26-30. But since sin is the transgression of the law, it also necessarily follows that “the law” will be in full force in all the world until the coming of the Lord. In other words, sin is the disease, and it cannot exist where there is no law. Romans 4:15. The disease, sin, does exist in “every creature” in “all the world;” for the remedy, the gospel, is to be thus extensively made known, and the great Physician would not send the remedy where it is not needed. “They that be whole need not a physician; but they that are sick” (Matthew 9:12); and therefore the law, by which alone “is the knowledge of sin”-the disease-is binding upon “every creature” “in all the world.” Now since “the wages of sin”-the transgression of the law-“is death” (Romans 6:23), it is important that all men know just what that law is, the transgression of which brings death, and just what its nature and requirements. These points will therefore next claim our attention. {SITI February 3, 1890, p. 82.2}

**“A Sunday Law for the District of Columbia” The Signs of the Times, 16, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

On the 6th of January, Mr. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, introduced into the House of Representatives a bill which is entitled, “A Bill to Prevent Persons from Being Forced to Labor on Sunday,” which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It reads as follows:- {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.3}

“Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representativess of the United States of America, in congress assembled, that it shall be unlawful for any person, or corporation, or employe of any person or corporation, in the District of Columbia, to perform any secular labor or business, or to cause the same to be performed by any person in their employment on Sunday, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or services performed or rendered in violation of this act. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.4}

“Any person or corporation, or employe of any person or corporation, in the District of Columbia, who shall violate the provisions of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $100 for every such offense; *provided, however*, that the provisions of this act shall not be considered to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest.” {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.5}

The bill is misleading in its nature. To give the proposed law the appearance of moderation and benevolence, it is entitled, “A Bill to Prevent Persons from Being Forced to Labor on Sunday.” If that were really what the framers of that bill are exercised over, they might save their labor; for there is no more necessity for a law to prevent people from being forced to labor on Sunday, than there is for a law to prevent them from being forced to wear woolen clothes in the summer-time. If a person wishes to wear woolen in the summer-time, he has the privilege. If he prefers cotton or linen, he can wear that. So, if people wish to labor on Sunday, they usually do; and if they don’t want to, there is no power that can compel them to. For section one of the thirteenth amendment to the constitution says that- {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.6}

“Neither slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.” {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.7}

The title of the bill would imply that there are some people in the United States who are compelled to labor on Sunday against their will. If there are any such, they should demand the right which the Constitution of the United States guarantees to them. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.8}

It is a fact that a great many people in the United States labor on Sunday; and it is also a fact that those who labor on that day do so because they do not regard the day as sacred. If they did not labor they would spend the day in amusement. That the bill does not mean what its title says, is further shown by the very first clause, namely, that it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation, etc., to perform any labor or business. Anyone would naturally suppose that a capitalist or company of capitalists would not be in a position to be forced to labor by anybody. They can labor or not as they choose. And when they labor on Sunday it is because they choose to, and not because they are forced to. Therefore when the bill says that it shall be unlawful for anybody to perform labor on Sunday, it contradicts its title, which says that its purpose is to prevent people from being *forced* to labor on that day. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.9}

Again, why is the adjective “secular” used before “labor or business”? Why is it that only secular labor or business is to be forbidden on Sunday? *Secular* is the opposite of *religious*; and the reason why secular labor is specified is that Sunday is regarded as a sacred or religious day, upon which it is by many considered wicked to perform secular labor. Therefore the bill spears on the face of it to be in the line of religious legislation. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.10}

The fact that this is simply a piece of religious legislation is further shown by the exemption at the close of the bill, where it is provided that the act “shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday, as a day of rest.” Civil government has nothing whatever to do with the conscience of men. But this bill takes into account conscientious convictions. It is a bill for the purpose of compelling everybody to conscientiously observe some day of the week as a day of rest, or, if some have no conscience in the matter, to compel them to act as though they had. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.11}

So far as the exemption is concerned, it amounts to nothing. If the bill should become a law, the condition of things would be the same as it is now; for since the world stood, nobody ever heard of a Sunday law being enforced, when it had an exemption clause. If it is determined to compel people to observe Sunday, the clause must be left out. If the exemption is retained, and the bill passes, it will be a nullity. In showing the inconsistency of this bill, we make no reflection on the honorable member who drew it up. He doubtless did the best he could with a bad job. The statesman never yet lived who was wise enough to frame a Sunday law which should be consistent with itself and with civil rights. E. J. W. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.12}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:15-20” The Signs of the Times, 16, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 21, February 22, 1890.)**

1. What was effected by the blood of the old covenant? {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.13}

2. Was any sin ever removed by that covenant? {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.14}

3. What can the blood of Christ accomplish? {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.15}

4. What provision is made for transgressors under the first covenant? Hebrews 9:13. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.16}

5. What law did they transgress under the first covenant? {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.17}

6. Then if Jesus is Mediator for their transgressions, in behalf of what law is he the Mediator? {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.18}

7. By what means did he become their Redeemer? Verse 15. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.19}

8. Who are meant by them which are called? Ans.-All, of all ages and nations, to whom the word of salvation comes, or whom the Spirit of God moves to accept the word. See Acts 2:39. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.20}

9. What may they receive through the priesthood of Christ? Hebrews 9:15. See note. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.21}

10. What is necessary where there is a testament? Verse 16. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.22}

11. Why is this the case? Verse 17. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.23}

12. How was the old covenant ratified? Verse 18. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.24}

13. What did Moses speak to the people? Verse 19. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 82.25}

14. Where is this transaction recorded? Exodus 24:3-5. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.1}

15. What did Moses send young men to do? Verse 5. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.2}

16. Of what did their burnt-offerings consist? Compare Hebrews 9:18. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.3}

17. What did Moses do with the blood?-*Ib.*, Exodus 24:6, 8. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.4}

18. With what did he sprinkle the blood? {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.5}

**NOTES**

Verse 15 has a fund of instruction underlying the first glance at the language. It is made very sure that Jesus is the Mediator between the people who lived under the first covenant, and the law which God proclaimed to them, of which they were transgressors. And it is absurd to suppose that God will judge the family of Adam, moral agents, by different moral standards. It is the law given to the Jews, which David says is perfect, that it is righteousness, etc. It is the same law that Solomon says contains the whole duty of man, and by which God will bring every work into judgment. The commandments given to Israel in the wilderness are the lively oracles which Stephen said they received to give unto us. Acts 7:38. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.6}

In verse 15 is again introduced the contrast which was so successfully argued in chapter 4. Though the children of Israel rejoiced that they had had rest from their wanderings, and that the Lord had subdued their enemies before them, and given them homes for themselves and their children, they were yet subject to cares, to sickness, pain, and death. Joshua gave them a temporal rest. But a greater than Joshua had become the leader of his people, and the rest that remains is an eternal inheritance. And God is so wise and merciful in the provisions of his grace that the faithful even under the first covenant may share their inheritance. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.7}

**ADDITIONAL NOTE**

The primitive signification of *diatheke*, the Greek word translated “covenant,” is “will,” or “testament.” It comes from a word which signifies to put, set, make, to dispose of. Covenant, in the sense generally understood, that of “contract or agreement,” is only a derived meaning. The new covenant is the will and testament of our God, conveying, by as solemn ratification as the death of Christ could make it, what God bequeaths to his children. These things he had promised in the beginning; these promises he had repeated from time to time; but when Christ came the covenant, or the bequeathed blessings, were brought together into the last testament of him who was heir of all, and who gave his life for the world. Voluntarily he died to prove the strength of the promises which God made to his people, and of the great love of God for them. It had ever been sure in the purpose of God, but when Christ died, angels and men could doubt no longer. {SITI February 10, 1890, p. 91.8}

 **“Sunday-Law Petitions” The Signs of the Times, 16, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have just received the American Sabbath Union’s *Monthly Document*, No. 13, bearing date of December, 1889, the last page of which contains a copy of the new petition, which is being circulated in behalf of the national Sunday law. The following is a copy of the petition to be presented to the United States Senate, a duplicate being furnished for presentation to the House of Representatives:- {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.9}

*Petitions Gather by the...* *Sabbath Association*. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.10}

For a Sunday Re T Law.

The petition which follows was endorsed by a standing vote of.... to...(men and women of 21 years of age or more) by a meeting of citizens of the State (or Territory) of...County of...City (or Town) of...on .... {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.11}

Attest.... Presiding {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.12}

The petition which follows was endorsed at regularly called meetings by the following churches, labor societies, temperance unions, and other organizations of the above-named locality: ...Church...members, by vote of...to...Attest: .... Church...members, by vote of...to Attest: ... {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.13}

*To the United States Senate:* {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.14}

The above organizations and undersigned adult residents (21 years of age or more) of the place aforesaid, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill, forbidding, to the United States mail and military service, and in interstate commerce and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of real necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.15}

[Individual signatures to their own handwriting, preceded by Mr. or Mrs., or Miss. Add more paper for individual signatures.] {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.16}

There can be no question but that, in a certain sense at least, there is no attempt to deceive in this petition. It is about as bold an attempt to perpetrate a fraud as was ever conceived. It is presumed that petitions represent the will of the petitioners; but here is a deliberate plan to represent people as petitioning who have never expressed an opinion. The securing of the individual signatures is a secondary matter. If they are secured, more paper must be added; but on the petition paper there is no provision made for this. Wholesale representative indorsement is all that is planned for. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.17}

The reader will notice that the only chance for definiteness of statement in filling out the petition is the number of persons belonging to the church or organization voting. The number of people voting is left indefinite. For instance, if the matter were presented at a meeting of an organization containing 300 members, a part of whom were present, and a portion only of those present voting, the petition would be filled out, stating that the petition which followed was indorsed at a regularly-called meetings of the Blanktown Methodist Church, 300 members, by vote of 125 to 175. Which one of these numbers would be taken as representing the number of petitioners?-Of course it would be the largest number. They would not take the smallest, and they could not use the next larger, as that would not be definite; and so, following the old custom, where there is a doubt, they will count everything and thus be sure to have enough. Of course the exact number voting in any meeting might be ascertained by a simple count, but that would take too long; and the number of petitioners could not be increased so rapidly as by this method. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.18}

It is evident from the framing of the petition that it is not designed in any instance that the number of voters shall be counted. Only a few moments ago a friend was telling about a Sunday-law meeting which he attended in Milwaukee, which was conducted by Mr. Crafts. At the close those who favored the petition were requested to rise. Then Mr. Crafts said that they would not take time to count those who voted, as it was somewhat late, but that the pastor knew the number of sittings in the church, and he could fill out the petition. Since this is the way the work of securing petitioners for a Sunday law is carried on, we cannot see why they go through the formality of taking a vote; for it is not individual influence that is represented, but church pews. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.19}

We commend this work to the careful consideration of all who think that the passing of a Sunday law would be a righteous act. If Sunday laws are righteous, how is it that so much iniquity and deceit are indulged in to secure them? Do these people believe in doing evil that good may come? If they do, let them be warned by Romans 3:8. E. J. W. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.20}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:20-23” The Signs of the Times, 16, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 22, February 22, 1890.)**

1. Who spoke to Israel in behalf of the Lord when the first covenant was made? {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.21}

2. What did he do with the blood? {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.22}

3. What did he then say? Exodus 24:8; Hebrews 9:20. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.23}

4. Is there any difference in these texts? Ans.-The first says, made; the second, enjoined. The Hebrew word used has a number of significations. The conditions of the covenant were not arranged between the parties, but were matters enjoined. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.24}

5. What similar language did Jesus use in establishing the new covenant? Matthew 26:28; Mark 14:24. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.25}

6. What more did Moses sprinkle with blood? Hebrews 9:21. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.26}

7. In the typical law, were all things purified by blood? Verse 22. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.27}

8. What was the nature of the exceptions? See Numbers 19. See note. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.28}

9. What is necessary to the remission of sin? Hebrews 9:22. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.29}

10. Why was the blood chosen to make atonement? Leviticus 17:11. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.30}

11. What is meant in Genesis 9:6 by the words, “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood”? Ans.-As the life is in the blood, it is equivalent to saying, Whoso taketh man’s life. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.31}

12. What should be the fate of him who sheds the blood of man? Genesis 9:6. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.32}

13. What does this teach? Ans.-That only blood, or life, can atone for life. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.33}

14. Whose lives are forfeited to the law? See Romans 3:19, 23; 6:23. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.34}

15. Must we still depend upon blood to be cleared before the law? 1 John 1:7; Ephesians 1:7. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.35}

16. What was necessary in the earthly sanctuary? Hebrews 9:23. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.36}

17. Were the earthly holy places purified by the blood of bulls and goats? Leviticus 16:14, 15, 19. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.37}

18. What are the earthly things called? Hebrews 9:23. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.38}

19. Do the heavenly things need purifying?-*Ib.* {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.39}

20. How did the patterns become defiled? See note. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.40}

21. Who takes away our sins? John 1:29. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.41}

22. Why did Christ take our sins upon himself? Ans.-Because he is our High Priest; the priest bears the judgment of the people. Exodus 28:29, 30. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.42}

23. Where is he filling his priestly office? See Hebrews 8:1, 2. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.43}

24. Are the heavenly things defiled by our sins going to our priest? {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.44}

25. With what is it necessary for the heavenly things to be cleansed? Hebrews 9:23. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.45}

**NOTES**

Here again in verse 21 is a statement of that which we do not find in the writings of Moses. But we learn that the Jews had a tradition that such was the case, and in this instance their tradition must have been correct. In the account of the erection of the tabernacle, and the dedication of the holy things, it is recorded that they were anointed with oil, but the sprinkling of blood is not mentioned. This, however, does not involve any contradiction. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.46}

The fact that some things, and in some cases persons, were purified without blood, see Numbers 19, does not disagree with the reasonable statement that without shedding of blood is no remission; for, in cases of purification with oil, or water, there was no sin. There were misfortunes, as in certain sicknesses, or accidents, fleshly defilements. But the wages of sin is death, always, and where the penalty is death nothing but life can meet the demand of the law. Now as the blood is the life of man (Deuteronomy 12:23), it is given to make atonement. Leviticus 17:11. The offering of blood for life signifies life for life. Hence the statement that we have redemption through the blood of Christ. It means that our lives are purchased with his life, God’s appointments are in strict accord with reason and justice. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.47}

No objection against the true doctrine of the atonement is more persistently urged than this, that there can be nothing in heaven that needs cleansing. Such pleading for heaven reminds us of the zeal of Peter in vindicating his Lord. Matthew 16:21-23. But to prove that the heavenly sanctuary does need cleansing because of our sins taken by our Priest, and that nothing but the blood of Christ can cleanse it, is the whole drift of the apostle’s argument. Take away this great truth, and his labored argument would be without any logical conclusion. Not only were the earthly sacrifices typical of Christ’s sacrifice, and the earthly priests typical of his priesthood, but the earthly sanctuary was typical of the heavenly holy places. And of course the cleansing of the sanctuary on earth with the blood of bulls and goats was typical of the purifying of the heavenly things with better sacrifice. In the whole argument of this remarkable letter, nothing is made more plain than this. {SITI February 17, 1890, p. 91.48}

**“A Movement to Unite Church and State” The Signs of the Times, 16, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of January 6, there appeared the text of the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, “respecting establishments of religion in free public schools.” This, as was then stated, is but the repetition, in slightly modified form, of the resolution proposed by Senator Blair at the last Congress. The resolution is contradictory, in that, while it says that no “State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof,” it provides that “each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the instruction of all the children living therein, between the ages of six to sixteen years inclusive, in the common branches of learning, in virtue and morality, and in the knowledge of the fundamental and nonsectarian principles of Christianity.” That is, while it professes to be constitutional, and to be opposed to any State establishment of religion, its whole intent is to provide for that very thing. For we shall show that for the States to establish schools for the purpose of teaching the principles of Christianity, would be to unite Church and State. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.49}

The resolution calls for the instruction of children in the “fundamental and nonsectarian principles of Christianity.” Now what are the fundamental principles of Christianity? It is self-evident that Christianity pertains to Christ, and that nothing can be taught in regard to Christianity without teaching Christ. Where do we learn about Christ? and what shall we teach about him? We learn of Christ in the Bible, and nowhere else. All we know of Christ is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, and therefore that which is taught of Christ, in teaching the fundamental principles of Christianity, must be what the Bible reveals concerning him. So the very first thing in teaching Christianity is the consideration of who Christ is. And what about him? What does he do for us? What is the nature of his work? The simple answer to these points, according to the Bible, would be that Christ is the Son of God; the divine word who was in the beginning with God, by whom all things were created; who was made flesh and dwelt among men; who died and rose again to redeem men and to save them from sin. And this brings up the fact that men have sinned against God; they have broken his law. And so, to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity is to teach the law of God, which points out sin, and to teach Christ as the Saviour from sin; to teach his power and majesty as the one who is able to save from sin; in short, the fundamental principles of Christianity are all there is of it. You cannot teach anything about Christianity without teaching these very things. For Christianity may be summed up in a word as the way of salvation from sin, through Christ. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.50}

Suppose now the State enters upon the work of giving this instruction to all children within its borders. What is it doing?-It is doing the very work for which the church of Christ exists. Christ instituted a church here upon earth that it might be the light of the world, that it might spread abroad in the earth a knowledge of him and of his truth. That is all the church is for. Now when we have the entire government doing this work in every school district, we have simply the State organizing itself into a universal church. That would be a State Church, a union of Church and State. Nothing less than this can be made of it. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.51}

Again, the bill says “the fundamental and *non-sectarian* principles of Christianity.” By that is meant those principles which are not peculiar to any sect, but which all denominations can unite upon. Please consider the fundamental principles of Christianity, as we have referred to them, and see upon which one of them all denominations are agreed. Christianity means the doctrine of Christ. Who is Christ? Some say he is the divine Son of God, and others deny this. Some say that his work was vicarious, others that he simply lived and died as an example. There has been disagreement upon the very first principles of Christianity ever since the church existed. So that if the public schools are to teach the principles of Christianity, they must teach principles that are held by some denominations and disbelieved by others. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.52}

In his book, “Romanism versus the Public-School System,” page 170, Dr. Daniel Dorchester says:- {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.53}

“It is plain that is all classes are to use the public school, there must be no specific religious instruction. It cannot be imparted consistently with the American system of government; if religious instruction is given, it will be almost certain to savor of some particular sect.” {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.54}

The same thing is put more forcibly by the Honorable Stanley Matthews, in a speech in reference to the Bible in the schools of Cincinnati. Said he:- {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.55}

“The Gentlemen on the other side say they limit the religious instruction demanded to what they call a ‘broad Christianity.’ I have already once or twice averted to the term. I do not know that I understand it. If I do, it is a vain and unmeaning generality. It is a definite and positive thing. It means something or it means nothing. In my view it is a supernatural scheme of redemption-a revelation from God of his gracious purpose and plan of salvation to a race ‘dead in trespasses and sins,’ through the mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ, who, being God from eternity, became incarnate for sin, made expiation for it, and, having risen from the grave, ascended into heaven, and there sitteth on the right hand of the Father to make intercession for his people. The whole character and value of such a religion consists altogether in being, as it claims to be, a supernatural plan of salvation from sin. Otherwise it is irremedial. Strike out from the Bible the parts which disclose, reveal, and teach that scheme, and the rest is insignificant. And any instruction or education in religion which does not teach the facts which constitute that scheme, and which cannot be stated even, except as conveying dogma, is no instruction in the Christian religion whatever.” {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.56}

This is the truth clearly and forcibly stated. If the principles of Christianity are to be taught at all, the whole must be taught. Christianity is a unit, and the whole of it is contained in the fundamental principles. If the State is going into the business of teaching this, then we ask, How will the work of the school-teacher differ from that of the Sunday-school teacher and the minister of the gospel? And the only answer is that their work will be a little more comprehensive. They will be doing the work of the minister and the Sunday-school teacher, and, together with that, will be giving instruction in the sciences. So that, as we said before, for the public schools of the United States to teach the fundamental principles of Christianity would be to establish a State Church, to effect a union of Church and State in the most complete manner possible. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.57}

We have already shown that nonsectarian instruction in religion cannot be given. Such instruction will necessarily savor of some particular sect, as Dr. Dorchester says. And this, it is admitted, would be to effect a union of Church and State. Thus, in the book before referred to, on page 65, Dr. Dorchester, in referring to an appropriation by the State of New York to certain Catholic schools, says:- {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.58}

“The people thus found themselves taxed for the support of sectarian education, the Roman Catholic faith being taught in the schools thus supported. The State and the Church were then virtually united.” {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.59}

It is plainly evident that whatever way we consider this proposed amendment, it is really an amendment to effect a union of Church and State. We have not in this article touched upon some of the pernicious results that would necessarily grow out of the adoption of the amendment, except as the readers may infer for themselves some of the evils that would result from a Church and State union. In another article we shall show some of the wickedness that would follow its adoption. E. J. W. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.60}

**“Letter to the Hebrews. Chapter 9:24-28” The Signs of the Times, 16, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

**(Lesson 23, March 8, 1890.)**

1. With what were the earthly holies purified? {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.61}

2. Whose office was it to cleanse the sanctuary? {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.62}

3. Do the heavenly things need cleansing? {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.63}

4. Where has our High Priest entered? Hebrews 9:24. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.64}

5. Why could not Christ act as priest in the earthly sanctuary? Chap. 8:4. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.65}

6. If the earthly was the pattern of the heavenly, must there not be two holy places in the heavenly? Hebrews 9:23, 24. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.66}

7. What does the word “true” mean in verse 24? Ans.-The true holy places-holy places understood. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.67}

8. Where are the true holy places? Verse 24. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.68}

9. How often did the high priest enter the most holy on earth? Verse 25. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.69}

10. How often does Christ enter the heavenly sanctuary for us?-*Ib*. See Verse 12. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.70}

11. What is meant by the end of the world, verse 26? Ans.-The last dispensation. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.71}

12. For what hath Christ appeared?-*Ib*. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.72}

13. Whose sins did he come to put away? Compare chap. 7:25. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.73}

14. Whose sins does he put away? Ans.-Only those who cease to sin. They who continue to transgress the law of God never have their sins put away; they retain them. Matthew 7:21. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.74}

15. How did he accomplish this work? Hebrews 9:26. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.75}

16. What is appointed to all men? Verse 27. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.76}

17. What comes after death?-*Ib*. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.77}

18. What is implied by introducing the judgment as following death? Ans.-That the judgment is consequent upon this life, and for one probation only. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.78}

19. What analogy is shown between our probation and the death of Christ? Ans.-As we die one, living but one life, having but one probation, so Christ once died to bear sins. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.79}

20. For how many did he die?-Ib. Compare chap. 2:9. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.80}

21. What is meant by the words, “He hath once appeared,” Hebrews 9:26? Ans.-He has made one advent to this world. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.81}

22. Will he appear again? Verse 28. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.82}

23. How will he appear?-*Ib*. See note. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.83}

24. For what purpose will he appear?-*Ib*. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.84}

25. To whom will he appear unto salvation?-*Ib*. See 2 Timothy 4:1, 8. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.85}

26. How will he appear to those who do not look for him, nor love his appearing? 2 Thessalonians 1:6-8; Revelation 6:15-17. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.86}

**NOTE**

It is to be regretted that commentators have so generally overlooked the true intent of Hebrews 9:28, and construed it to mean “without a sin-offering.” The original word occurs seventy-three times in the New Testament, and is rendered “sinful,” once; “offense,” once; “sin,” seventy-one times. It is never claimed that it can bear the sense of sin-offering in the New Testament, except in 2 Corinthians 5:21, and Hebrews 9:28. And we are very confident that it does not in either of these texts. In 2 Corinthians 5:21 the contrast and the force are measurably lost by so rendering it. “He hath made him to be sin for us, who himself knew no sin.” Our iniquity was laid upon him; he was bruised for our sakes-in our stead. He bore our sin, and suffered as if he had actually been the sinner. The Scripture doctrine of substitution is entirely too strong and clear to admit of this text being changed into sin-offering. In Hebrews 9 there is presented a series of events, mostly in contrast with the things of the earthly service, each of which occurs without being repeated. He offered one sacrifice; he offered it but once; he entered once into the heavenly sanctuary. Man dies once (therefore there is but one probationary life); and after this one death, the judgment. So Christ was once offered to bear sin; and he will once more (a second time) come, without sin. He was once offered to bear sin; he bore it on the cross; he bears our judgment-the iniquity of his priesthood-before the throne. As a priest he has continually taken sins, except from those who choose to retain them. But when he comes again, he will be separated from sin; he will bear sin no more. As it reads, it signifies that at his second coming his priesthood, his act of sin-bearing, is forever ended. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.87}

The difference is evident and material. He might come without a sin-offering, he might not renew his sacrifice, and yet not make an end of his priestly service. He has made but one offering in more than 1,850 years, and his priesthood has continued all these centuries by virtue of that one offering. And it mighty continue indefinitely, in the same manner, by that one and the same offering. All these centuries he has been receiving the sins of penitents. But he comes without sin, separate or apart from sin, as it really means. This indicates that he will bear sin no more; that he has put it from him. Then he that is unjust must so remain. Revelation 22:10-12. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.88}

The following remarks from Dr. Barnes on this text, concerning the coming again of our blessed Saviour, are interesting:- {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.89}

“There is a propriety that he should thus return. He came once to be humbled, despised, and put to death; and there is a fitness that he should come to be honored in his own world. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.90}

“Every person on earth is interested in the fact that he will return, for ‘every eye shall see him.’ Revelation 1:7. All who are now in their graves, all who now live, and all who will hereafter live, will behold the Redeemer in his glory. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.91}

“It will not be merely to gaze upon him, and to admire his magnificence, that they will see him. It will be for greater and more momentous purposes-with reference to an eternal doom. {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.92}

“The great mass of men are not prepared to meet him. They do not believe that he will return; they do not desire that he should appear; they are not ready for the solemn interview which they will have with him. His appearing now would overwhelm them with surprise and horror. There is nothing in the future which they less expect and desire than the second coming of the Son of God, and in the present state of the world his appearance would produce almost universal consternation and despair. It would be like the coming of the flood of waters on the old world; like the sheets of flame on Sodom and Gomorrah.” {SITI February 24, 1890, p. 91.93}