**“Christ the End of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 18, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the preceding articles we have considered the fundamental principles of the law, and all its bearings. We have by no means exhausted the subject, for that would be impossible; neither have we referred to all the texts relating to it; but we have given an outline of the nature of the law, its origin, perpetuity, extent of jurisdiction, and the relation to it of both righteous and wicked. By the principles of the law, which have already been enunciated, every text in the Bible that mentions the law may be explained; and, bearing those principles in mind, we shall now proceed to consider the application of some texts that are too often regarded as antagonistic to the law. Without a knowledge of the principles of the law, these texts may justly be considered as difficult; but with such knowledge, we find not only that they are in perfect harmony with those principles, but that they greatly strengthen the argument already made. Right here we will say that the task of “harmonizing” different portions of the Bible is one which no man has to perform. The different portions of the Bible were harmonized by inspiration; all that the expositor has to do is to point out the harmony that already exists. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 52.6}

In Romans 10:4 we read as follows: “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth.” Before showing what this text means, it may be well to briefly show what it does not mean. It does not mean that Christ has put an end to the law; because (1) Christ himself said concerning the law, “I am not come to destroy.” Matthew 5:17. (2) The prophet said that instead of destroying it, the Lord would “magnify the law, and make it honorable.” Isaiah 42:21. (3) The law was in Christ’s own heart. “Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” Psalm 40:7, 8. And (4) since the law is the righteousness of God, the foundation of his government, it could not by any possibility be abolished. See Luke 16:17. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 52.7}

A reading of the verses preceding the one quoted should suggest its meaning: “Brethren, my heart’s desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God’s righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.” Romans 10:1-3. Bear in mind that “the righteousness of God” is his law. Isaiah 51:6, 7. We can see that Paul uses the term in this sense; for, without any break for explanation, he adds, “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness,” etc. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 52.8}

From these verses we learn that Paul, instead of teaching that the law has come to an end, is showing that Israel, through ignorance, had failed to realize the design of the law in securing righteousness. What had caused this failure? Paul says it was because they were ignorant of God’s righteousness, and went about to establish their own righteousness. They had such low views of the righteousness of God, as required by his law, that they thought they could make themselves righteous. But, as we have already seen, all men are sinful, and while in the flesh cannot please God. Romans 8:8. The only way in which men can appear as righteous, is to have that “righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ.” When their faith is imputed to them for righteousness, they become, in Christ, new creatures (2 Corinthians 5:17), and thenceforth it is possible that with them all things shall be of God. But the Jews rejected Christ, and therefore failed to secure that righteousness which the law was designed to perfect in man. A comparison of Scripture texts will show that the view here outlined is the correct one. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 52.9}

The reader must know that the word “end” does not necessarily mean “termination.” It is often used in the sense of design, object, or purpose. For instances where it is so used, see James 5:11; John 18:37; Romans 14:9; Amos 5:18; Luke 18:1; Hebrews 13:7; 1 Peter 1:9. In reading these texts no one would get the idea that faith is ended, or that the Lord had ceased to exist. So in reading Romans 10:4, even without an explanation, one need not suppose that “end” means cessation of existence. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.1}

**WHAT DOES IT MEAN?**

Now for a more detailed exposition of the text. In 1 Timothy 1:5 the same writer says: “Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.” The word here rendered “charity” is often rendered “love,” and is so rendered in this place in the New Version. In John 5:3 we read: “This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;” and Paul himself says that “love is the fulfilling of the law.” Romans 13:10. In both these texts the same word (*agapa*) is used that occurs in 1 Timothy 1:5. Therefore we say that this text means, Now the design of the commandment (or law) is that it should be kept. Everybody will recognize this as a self-evident fact. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.2}

But this is not the ultimate design of the law. In the verse following the one under consideration Paul quotes Moses as saying of the law that “the man that doeth those things shall live by them.” Christ said to the young man, “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” Matthew 19:17. Now since the design of the law was that it should be kept, or, in other words, that it should produce righteous characters, and the promise is that those who are obedient shall live, we may say that the ultimate design of the law was to give life. And in harmony with this thought are the words of Paul, that the law “was ordained to life.” Romans 7:19. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.3}

But “all have sinned and come short of the glory of God,” and “the wages of sin is death.” Thus it is impossible for the law to accomplish its design in making perfect characters and consequently giving life. When a man has once broken the law, no subsequent obedience can ever make his character perfect. And therefore the law which was ordained unto life, is found to be unto death. Romans 7:10. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.4}

If we were to stop right here, with the law unable to accomplish its purpose, we should leave all the world under condemnation and sentence of death. Now we shall see that Christ enables man to secure both righteousness and life. We read that we are “justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” Romans 3:24. “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Romans 5:1. More than this, he enables us to keep the law. “For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:21. In Christ, therefore, it is possible for us to be made perfect—the righteousness of God,—and that is just what we would have been by constant and unvarying obedience to the law. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.5}

Again we read: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.... For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” Romans 8:1-4. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.6}

What could not the law do? It could not free a single guilty soul from condemnation. Why not?—Because it was “weak through the flesh.” There is no element of weakness in the law; the weakness is in the flesh. It is not the fault of a good tool that it cannot make a sound pillar out of a rotten stick. The law could not cleanse a man’s past record, and make him sinless; and poor, fallen man had no strength resting in his flesh to enable him to keep the law. And so God imputes to believers the righteousness of Christ, who was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, so that “the righteousness of the law” might be fulfilled in their lives. And thus Christ is the end of the law. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.7}

But life is promised to the obedient, and as Christ enables his people to obey the law, he thus secures to them eternal life. Paul says that Christ has “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” 2 Timothy 1:10. Christ himself says: “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” John 10:10. “For 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. And because Christ meets the end or design of the law which was ordained to life, he is called our life, as Paul says: “When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.” Colossians 3:4. {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.8}

To conclude, then, we have found that the design of the law was that it should give life because of obedience. All men have sinned and been sentenced to death. But Christ took upon himself man’s nature, and will impart of his own righteousness to those who accept his sacrifice, and finally, when they stand, through him, as doers of the law, he will fulfill to them its ultimate object, by crowning them with eternal life. And so we repeat, what we cannot too fully appreciate, that Christ is made unto us “wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” {SITI December 7, 1891, p. 68.9}

**“God in Government” The Signs of the Times, 18, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

Sunday, November 15, was a great day in Boston churches. It was the Sunday of the National W.C.T.U. Convention, and although there were no meetings of the association on that day, nearly all the pulpits of the city were occupied by the ladies of the union. In the evening Tremont Temple was well filled, the occasion being an address by Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, the W. C. T. U. “round-the-world missionary.” The subject as “God in Government.” It being the regular church service, the pastor, Rev. Dr. George C. Lorimer, presided, and the Rev. Joseph Cook offered the prayer. Only the first part of the address was devoted to the subject, the latter part being simply temperance statistics; but in that first part some points were touched upon that are worthy of note, not for the sake of refuting them, but to serve as a warning, that those who read may discern and avoid the fatal error which lies at the foundation of these modern schemes for so-called National Reform. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.10}

The speaker read Isaiah 9:6, 7 for her text, and then said that God had instituted two kinds of government in the earth. The first was that of the family. But this kind of government was found to be a failure, and therefore God institute the theocracy, which lasted down through the time of the judges, until Israel rejected God by rejecting Samuel. The second form of government-the theocracy-is what the speaker, together with other National Reformers, hopes soon to see again established in the earth, and to this end they are laboring. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.11}

Right here let it be noted that the failure of family government is what leads to schemes to enforce morality by law. The design is that the State shall take the place of the parent, and do what the parent has failed to do. This fact was virtually admitted by the speaker, when she said that the theocracy was established because family government was a failure. But let it be borne in mind that the theocracy was not established because the family-government scheme was a failure, for the theocracy existed no less in the days of Adam, Noah, and Abraham than in the days of Gideon and Samuel. Moreover, God has never set aside the system of family government. In the days of Samuel the priest Eli was sternly rebuked and punished by the Lord, “because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not.” 1 Samuel 3:15. And the command for children to obey their parents in the Lord, and for parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is always in force. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.12}

It is a fact, however, that family government is in most cases a failure. And why?—Simply because the parents themselves do not fear God. The power of the gospel is not known. When God does not rule in the hearts of the parents, it is not to be expected that through them he should rule the children. It is because of this failure in family government that people want to establish a theocracy; but this shows that the longed-for theocracy is but a substitute for the gospel; for with it family government would be a success, and God himself would thereby rule. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.13}

After stating that the theocracy was in force until God was rejected in the person of Samuel, the speaker said that since then there have been only here and there spots where God’s right to govern had been recognized. One of those places was said to be England, under Cromwell, and it was stated that “for a brief time God ruled in Massachusetts.” The speaker expressed confidence that the time will soon come when the government shall again rest on the shoulder of Jesus Christ. I could not help wondering what the Baptist pastor, Dr. Lorimer, thought of the alleged government by God in Massachusetts. At the time referred to, Baptists were imprisoned and whipped, simply for refusing to have their children sprinkled. Is it not strange that professed Christians will at this day charge upon God the government of Massachusetts, at a time when barbarities were perpetrated that would disgrace Mohammed, and that a Christian woman can long for the return of such a time? {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.14}

The question that naturally followed was, “How are we going to put the government on the shoulder of Jesus Christ?” Sure enough, how are we? The text says, “The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.” The Father says to the Son, “Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.” Psalm 2:8. The Saviour declared that his kingdom is not of this world, and liened himself, in his return to the Father in heaven, to a nobleman going into a far country, “to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.” Luke 19:12. He receives the kingdom from the Father, while he is in heaven, and then returns, “having received the kingdom.” When Christ returns to this earth, it will be in his kingdom, sitting upon the throne of his glory. It is therefore a difficult task that the National Reformers have set for themselves, namely, that of putting the government on Christ’s shoulder. They have undertaken a job which requires nothing less than the zeal and power of the Lord of hosts. Thus they, in their shortsightedness, put themselves in the place of God. This very thing stamps all human schemes to get God in the government of this world, to give the government to Christ, to put it upon his shoulder, etc., as simply a phase of that “man of sin,” “who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” 2 Thessalonians 2:4. In saying this I do not impugn the motives or the sincerity of those who are in this movement of so-called National Reform. They simply “know not what they do.” If they had more confidence in the power of God, they would have less confidence in their own power. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.15}

But here is the answer to the question as to how we are to get the government upon Christ’s shoulder; God could do it alone if he so planned. He is calling out of the world a seed to serve him, who will receive his law, and write it in their hearts. What does God mean by giving us those ten commandments? We must look to them as the guide of our moral conduct, and the nation must adopt them. Not one law must be left on the statute books but the ten commandments.” They, it was stated, must be the basis of all legislation. This, it is claimed, would put God into the government. But right here is where the great evil of the whole scheme lies; it aims to make men perfect by law, and is therefore directly opposed to the gospel. Let us note, in brief, a few points where the plan to make the ten commandments the law of civil government is opposed to the Bible, and positively wicked. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.16}

**ITS RESULTS**

1. It would constitute men judges of moral conduct. But we are absolutely forbidden to judge another. See Matthew 7:1; Romans 2:1; 14:4; James 4:11, 12. God alone is judge of morals, and this plan would put man in his place. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.17}

2. It would make men judges of the law of God. This again would be to put man in the place of God. And this would inevitably result in— {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.18}

3. A low standard of morals. Only the One whence the law came can know it perfectly. Man’s conceptions of it is faulty. Not only we, but man’s judgment of his fellows is necessarily faulty, because he can judge only from the outward appearance. But a man may appear very righteous outwardly, and yet be abominably corrupt within. Yet the judge is unable to read the man’s heart, would have to decide that such a man is righteous,—that he is in perfect harmony with the law. Thus it would bring the standard of the moral law down to the level of man’s action. Men would be taught that God’s law is no greater in its requirements than what any man has the ability to do if he only has a mind to do it. But the Scripture tells us first “the law is spiritual,” and hence that it cannot be known, must less done, by one who is not spiritual. To attempt to enforce obedience to the ten commandments is to ignore the Spirit of God. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.19}

4. It would be to enforce sin. The law is spiritual, and the natural man cannot know it. All that the law of God can do for a sinner is to show him that he is a sinner. “By the law is the knowledge of sin.” The State could deal only with the law as interpreted by fallible men. But the highest idea that the natural man can get of the law of God is so far below the law as it actually is that his idea of the law is sin. That is, that which the natural man takes to be the perfect righteousness of the law is nothing but the reflection of his own evil heart. But this is all that the State could even attempt to enforce, therefore the attempt to make the ten commandments the law of the land would be to see the machinery of the State to crowd out the gospel, by teaching men to trust to heathen human power for righteousness. This matter may be dwelt upon more at length at another time. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.20}

The speaker exhorted her hearers to see that “no man has your support for any office however small or large, who is not a man of faith and prayer.” The reader can imagine what an endless amount of prying, spying, judging, criticism, gossiping, scandal vending, etc., would result from such a scheme. A man’s standing in the church would have to be settled before election. No man would think of running for office without a certificate from his pastor; and the length, quality and fervor of his prayers would be canvassed on every street corner. Whether it would result in the would be candidate’s making long and fervent prayers on the street corners, to be seen of men, is not certain, but there can be no doubt but that a high premium would be placed on hypocrisy. The horde of hungry office seekers would speedily become men of prayer. As to the matter of faith, that could be settled only by an inquisition. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 68.21}

Sunday laws were declared to be a necessity, “because law is an educator, and prevents good people from doing wrong.” As an illustration, the lady stated that after the California Sunday law was repealed, she was in the southern part of the State, and to her horror she saw, as she was going to church on Sunday morning a man engaged in well digging. After the service she spoke to the pastor about it, and he replied, with a groan, “That man belongs to my church.” We were left to infer that if there had been a Sunday law to compel rest, that good man would not have committed the sin of digging a well on Sunday, but would have gone to church. So it seems that when men succeed to their own satisfaction in placing the government on the shoulder of Jesus Christ, the churches will be filled on Sunday. We cannot see how the adoption of the ten commandments as the law of the State could have anything to do with the observance of Sunday, but allowing that Sunday-keeping is declared necessary, what virtue can there be in Sunday-keeping of the man who keeps the day because the law compels him to do so. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 84.1}

As might be expected, California was cited as the terrible example of the result of no Sunday law. She said that “there was an epidemic of Sunday-breaking when the California Sunday law was repealed.” I was living in the state at the time, and could not discern the slightest difference. Moreover, at not time have I ever seen in any city in California so much work being done on Sunday as was being done between Tremont Temple and the hotel at which I stopped, at the very hour that Mrs. Leavitt was speaking. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 84.2}

It was quite a severe charge against the piety of the churches of the land, when Mrs. Leavitt, in her praise of the Christianizing effects of law, referred by the effects of the laws against gambling and against lotteries, which she said that all States except Louisiana have enacted. Said she, “I have spoken in churches built by lotteries that were managed by ministers. We don’t do that now.” I should not have ventured to say before that congregation that the churches of our country, ministers included, are kept from gambling in lotteries solely by fear of the civil law. Surely nothing more is needed to show the quality of the piety that is expected by even the most enthusiastic supporters of Christianity by law. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 84.3}

It is perhaps needless to add that, according to the speaker, all these “blessings” will fill our land as soon as the ballot is placed in the hands of woman. As I listened to the discourse, and thought of the thousands who, without a thought, accept such teaching as the truth of God, my inward thought was, Oh, that they might understand the gospel and see the truth as it is in Jesus! May God speedily send forth his light and his truth, to save well-meaning people from dishonoring him and his law. {SITI December 14, 1891, p. 84.4}

**“Lock that Door” The Signs of the Times, 18, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above very suggestive heading the Boston *Sunday Globe* (November 15) contained a strong editorial plea for universal Sunday observance. A Sunday newspaper pleading for Sunday observance is, in itself, enough of an anomaly to attract attention, but the article exhibits so clearly the object and results of Sunday legislation that it is worth reproducing entire:— {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.5}

**“Lock that Door**

“That is the store door, the shop and factory door, Saturday night. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.6}

“And keep it locked while all enjoy one day of rest from this ceaseless moil for bread. Everybody says that, without necessarily going on to say one and the same thing as to how we shall even take this rest. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.7}

“Let us not have debate about how men ought to pass the whole time on Sunday. The question is undoubtedly in solution: for good citizens and worthy Christian folk, too, are now to be heard protesting a liberty that is in marked difference from the standards of even five and twenty years ago. For better or for worse, let the question go for the moment. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.8}

“But this is a pertinent question, far beyond the lines of creed or sect. Can the door be kept locked without the churches? If the churches should become empty, could Sunday be kept free from the encroachments of business? Someone has recently been observing Boston’s church attendance. Our town averages full as well as Western towns, and can probably endure comparison with any of her great sister cities east. But it becomes a very vital, a very serious question to the tired toiler. If church-going is relatively falling off, is our rest day in danger? Can the eager, active American people keep a rest day as often as once a week without the strong alliance of the religious sentiment to claim and enforce it? For, mark it, one day in seven for knocking off work and neglecting money-making is a rather frequent and expensive demand on our time. The seven, more or less, legal holidays of the year are not without some ugly and restless enemies among financiers and manufacturers. Some grasping employers are constantly breaking over. ‘To-morrow is Decoration day, eh? Come, men, what say you, work and take extra pay?’ {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.9}

“Sunday for rest cannot survive except conscience is on its side. This is the verdict of history among continental European races. But it is vastly truer of the active American people. The open church means the closed shop. The closed church, would mean the open shop. Educated young people who read this will instantly revert to classical times and the total failures repeatedly to set up and defend a seventh day as a rest day without religion to enforce it as a duty. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.10}

“Then shall we say that young fellow is a shirk who rides his bicycle all day Sunday? Well, shirk is a hard name. Still, isn’t that about the size of it? He expects others to sustain the church that sustains his day of rest, while he never goes near to help. Can that be square dealing, citizen with citizen? Shirk is a harsh characterization. But really, now, what is the right word for the young life that throws the entire burden of preserving his day sacred from toil upon other young lives, presumably as weary as his own all the week, but uphold the church on Sunday? Church-goers insist upon the day for conscience’ sake. The man who wholly secularizes the day-well does he make game of them as he sleepily watches these devotees of duty, and drawls out: “Go ahead, you dear dupes. This day is named Privilege. You feed Privilege and keep him alive, while I get on the bark of Privilege and ride.’ {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.11}

“It can be easily maintained that what religious service a man will sustain is his own affair. And it can be equally clearly shown that publicly ordered religious service, on some part of the day called Sunday, is the sole security of the day from secular greed and grasp. Why, then, is it one citizen’s burden more than another’s? What of him who slips his neck out altogether? Let be man among men, and lift together reverently to sustain the day, which certainly came to us from religious men before us. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.12}

“Emory J. Haynes.”

The thoughtful reader of the above will need to have his attention called to only a few points. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.13}

It is said that the day can be kept free from business only as it is kept as a religious day, and not, as a mere holiday. This is true; the rush of business in this age of greedy for money-making would soon call the pleasure seeker into the shop. But the fact is that those who abstain from labor on Sunday, from religious motives, are greatly in the minority, and their proportion to the whole population is diminishing. Preaching does not seem to have any appreciable effect in propping up Sunday observance. Therefore it follows that the only way to lock the door against Sunday Labor is by compelling men by law to act as though they were religious when they are not. In other words, Sunday can be preserved as a general rest day only by compelling men to be hypocrites. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.14}

This is further shown by the argument that regular church service and universal attendance are necessary to Sunday rest. Not the statement that “publicly-ordered religious service, on some part of the day called Sunday, is the sole security of the day from secular greed and grasp.” Therefore, the enforcement of Sunday rest means compulsory attendance on church service. Disregard for Sunday, means diminished church attendance, and this means diminished contributions for church support. Is not the last one secret of the effort to enforce Sunday observance? It must be; for if those who bewail slimly attended church services were thinking only of the spiritual loss to the absentees, they could go to the houses of the careless ones, and carry the gospel to them. Will the enforced attendance at church, which will follow enforced Sunday rest, mean also enforced support of the churches? {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.15}

Finally, it is worth while to note how the one is regarded who does not care to attend church on Sunday. If he mounts his bicycle for a little exercise, he is regarded as less than a man-a shirk. It is evidence from this that but little favor need be expected by those who do not choose to keep Sunday, when once it has been authoritatively declared that the safety of the State demands the preservation of religion, and that the preservation of religion demands the strict observance of Sunday. To too many poor souls the cry, “Lock that door!” will have a dread significance. {SITI December 21, 1891, p. 84.16}

**“Conditional Immortality” The Signs of the Times, 18, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

What is meant by conditional immortality?—Simply this, that immortality, or eternal life, which is the same thing, is conditional upon the individual’s belief in Christ. It means that “the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Romans 6:23. It is the doctrine which our Saviour himself taught, when he said: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John 3:36. Or, as expressed by the apostle: “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” 1 John 5:11. {SITI December 28, 1891, p. 84.17}

It is the doctrine which Christ taught to Nicodemus in these words: “For 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. It is the doctrine which gives Christ his rightful title of Life-giver, which he himself claimed, when he said: “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” John 10:10. {SITI December 28, 1891, p. 84.18}

To hear some men talk, one would get the idea that the doctrine of conditional immortality is rank infidelity, and utterly opposed to all true Christianity. As a matter of fact, it is based on the recognition of the fact that in all things Christ has the pre-eminence; that man can have nothing except as he gets it through Christ. {SITI December 28, 1891, p. 84.19}

As a matter of fact, a denial of the doctrine of conditional immortality is to that extent a denial of Christ. Indeed, we may truly say that it is wholly a denial of Christ, since it denies the very thing for which Christ came. He himself declares that his only object in coming to this earth to die, was that men might, by believing on him have life. Now the man who says that eternal life is not conditional upon believing in Christ, virtually says that man has no need of Christ. This was just what so many of the ancient Jews did, to whom Christ sadly said, “Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.” They did not profess to be Christians; they rejected Christ unreservedly. Is it not strange that in these days Christ is rejected in exactly the same way by those who profess to love and honor him? Why should people refuse to acknowledge that indebtedness to Christ for all that they have or hope to have? {SITI December 28, 1891, p. 84.20}