**“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 18**

1. Upon what did Paul exhort Timothy to lay hold? 1 Timothy 6:12. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.1}

2. By what means was he to lay hold of it? *Ib*. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.2}

3. Would it be consistent to exhort one to “lay hold” of the eternal life if he has it by nature? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.3}

4. To whom must we come in order to have life? John 5:40. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.4}

5. For what purpose did Christ say he came? John 10:10. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.5}

6. Then if men possess immortality by nature, did not Christ come in vain? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.6}

7. What is proved by the fact that he came to give life? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.7}

8. Who does Christ say have everlasting life? John 3:36. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.8}

9. In what sense do we have it now? 2 Timothy 1:1. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.9}

10. In whose keeping is this gift? 1 John 5:11. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.10}

11. Can one do anything more for Christ than to give up everything for his sake? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.11}

12. What does Christ say that those who do so shall receive in this present time? Mark 10:29, 30. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.12}

13. What shall they receive in the world to come? *Ib*. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.13}

14. Then when will eternal life be enjoyed? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.14}

15. At what time will immortality be bestowed? 1 Corinthians 15:51-54. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.15}

16. How is it that we receive immortality? Verses 52, 53. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.16}

17. Can a person “put on” that which he already has on? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.17}

18. Then what can you say as to man’s present possession of immortality? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.18}

19. What is due to Christ from all men? John 5:23. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.19}

20. How much honor is due him? *Ib*. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.20}

21. What does Christ alone have? John 6:68. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.21}

22. Through whom does eternal life come? Romans 6:23. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.22}

23. If men were by nature in possession of immortality, would they be dependent upon Christ for it? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.23}

24. Then is it not robbing Christ of the honor due him, to say that man possesses immortality whether they believe in him or not? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.24}

**LESSON FOR OCTOBER 25**

1. Concerning what did Paul wish the brethren not to be ignorant? 1 Thessalonians 4:13. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.25}

2. What is sleep often used to represent? John 11:11-14; Psalm 13:3. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.26}

3. What is the condition of a man in a sound sleep? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.27}

4. Then what must we conclude as to the Bible idea of the condition of man in death? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.28}

5. In what place are the dead sleeping? Daniel 12:2; Job 7:21. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.29}

6. What does Paul say that God will do for those who sleep in Jesus? 1 Thessalonians 4:14. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.30}

7. When will he do this? Verses 15, 16. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.31}

8. From what place will he bring them? John 5:28, 29. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.32}

9. In what sense, then, is it that God brings them “with him,” *i.e.* with Christ? Hebrews 13:20. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.33}

10. Who are they who go into the grave? Psalm 89:48. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.34}

11. What kind of a place is the grave? Job 10:20-22. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.35}

12. How is it described by the psalmist? Psalm 88:11, 12. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.36}

13. What does Solomon say as to the activity of those who go to the grave? Ecclesiastes 9:10. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.37}

14. Are we to understand, then, that the dead are entirely unconscious? Verse 5. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.38}

15. Do they not feel any of the emotions which sway the living? Verse 6. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.39}

16. Are they not affected even by the success or adversity of their best loved ones? Job 14:21. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.40}

17. If a tree is cut down, what may happen? Job 14:7-9. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.41}

18. What is said of the death of man? Verse 10. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.42}

19. How complete is the “wasting away” of man when he dies? Verses 11, 12. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.43}

20. How long will it be before the dead shall be raised out of their sleep? Verse 12. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.44}

21. When is it that the heavens shall pass away? 2 Peter 3:10. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.45}

22. Then at what time did Job locate the resurrection? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.46}

23. Where did he expect to stay while waiting for this event? Job 14:13; 17:13. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.47}

Since there was no paper last week, we this week print the questions for two Sabbaths, in order that those who are following the series may not lose the connection. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.48}

In John 10:10 we have Christ’s statement of the object which brought him to earth to die: “I am come that they [believers in him] might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” Compare this with his words in John 3:16. He came into the world to save sinners (1 Timothy 1:15); and since the wages of sin is *death*, it must follow that he gives life, as he says. And this statement cannot be turned aside from its literal meaning by saying, as Dr. Barnes does, that the word “abundantly” “denotes that which is not absolutely essential to *life*, but which is superadded to make life happy;” for it is not merely the ‘abundance” of life which he came to bestow, but *life* itself. “I am come *that they might have life*, and [something else] that they might have it more abundantly;” that is, to all eternity. But the fact that Christ came to give life, proves conclusively that we cannot have it without him, unless we are willing to admit that he came in vain-for a purpose wholly unnecessary. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.49}

The fact that life comes only through Christ is again and again repeated in the Bible. “He that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.” John 3:36. Here we have a most positive declaration; a plainer statement of the case could not be made. There are some, however, who misapply the first portion of the verse, and claim that even now, in this present life, Christians have the eternal life. But the beloved disciple, in repeating the words of Christ, says: “And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” 1 John 5:11. And this is how it is that “He that hath the Son hath life.” We have it in Christ. It is not ours in the sense of actual possession, but by promise. See 2 Timothy 1:1; Titus 1:2. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.50}

And when shall we receive this promise? Christ himself tells us. Said he: “There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel’s, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions.” This will be the portion of a follower of Christ in this world; but this is not all. He continues: “And in the world to come eternal life.” Mark 10:29, 30. So the eternal life is ours in this world only by promise; in the world to come it will be ours in fact. But so surely does Christ give life, that if we have him, we may say that we have life. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.51}

One word of explanation on John 3:36. “He that hath not the Son shall not see life.” Of course this can have no reference to this present life; it must refer to eternal life. That is the object for which man was created. This brief existence is but a preparation for eternal life. The Lord gives us a little period of time to see how we will use it. If we are faithful, he will at his coming give us that for which he has designed us. But if we do not appreciate this life, if we are not faithful in that which is least, what object could there be for him to give us that which is greatest, eternal life? None at all. If we do not gain that, our lives will have been spent in vain. The wicked will “be as though they had not been” (Obadiah 1:16), and so it can be said of them that they do not see life. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.52}

The great reason that we urge why men should accept the doctrine of conditional immortality is that it honors Christ. If we say that we possess immortality by nature, we deprive Christ of his highest honor. We virtually make ourselves independent of him. “The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Romans 6:23. Now if we claim immortality as ours by birthright, we may not deny the first part of this text, but we do the second. We may admit that immortality is the gift of God; but we must honor the Son even as we honor the Father. We must also admit that it comes only through Christ. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.53}

Few people realize it, but it is a fact that the doctrine that men are by nature immortal is really a denial of Christ. If Christ came to give life, and we claim to have it without him, do we not thus cast him off? Spiritualists have carried the doctrine of inherent, unconditional immortality to its legitimate conclusion, and openly repudiate Christ as a Saviour. If we hold the same doctrine, what warrant have we that we will not go to the same lengths as they? The doctrine of conditional immortality is the only safeguard against Spiritualism. Can anyone say that it is not a practical doctrine? {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.54}

Having learned that man is mortal and possesses no principle of immortality until the coming of the Lord and the resurrection, when he puts on immortality, we would naturally conclude that the dead are unconscious, extinct. And so the Bible represents them. Sleep is a common symbol of death. David says that when Michael stands up, “many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.” Daniel 12:2. Christ said when Lazarus was dead, “our friend Lazarus sleepeth.” John 11:11-14. David prays the Lord to remember him lest he “sleep the sleep of death.” Psalm 13:3. And Paul says of David after he had served his own generation, he “fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption.” Acts 13:36. Sleep is thus defined by Webster: “A natural and healthy, but temporary and periodical, suspension of the functions of the organs of sense.” Of the verb he says: “To take rest by a suspension of the voluntary exercise of the powers of the body and mind, an apathy of the organs of sense; to become unconscious.” Sleep is a synonym for unconsciousness. When a man is in a perilous position and knows nothing of it, we say that he is asleep to his danger. So death, in order to be fitly represented by sleep must be a total suspension of the functions of the organs of sense, and of all the powers of body and mind. And such we shall find the Bible declares it to be. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.55}

The dead go to the grave. They are said to “sleep in the dust.” It is a place to which both good and bad go. This of itself would prove that men do not go to Heaven at death. The following description of the place of the dead also shows that it is not Heaven: “A land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness.” Job 10:22. It is the “land of forgetfulness.” Psalm 88:12. It is from this place that the Lord will bring his faithful ones when he comes. Paul says concerning them that sleep: “For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him.” 1 Thessalonians 4:14. This does not mean that he will bring them from Heaven, but from the grave. See John 5:28, 29. The apostle in verse 14 has not yet introduced the coming of the Lord from Heaven. He has simply spoken of the death and resurrection of Christ. It was God who “brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ” (Hebrews 13:20), and if we believe in Jesus, he will bring us from the dead also, even as he did him. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.56}

But until the coming of the Lord, the dead remain in their graves, unconscious of passing the events. Read Solomon’s statements concerning them in Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6, 10. They “know not anything.” “There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave.” Even the prosperity or adversity of their best loved relatives, produces no emotion either of joy or sorrow. “His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.” Job 14:21. The utter extinction of man in the grave is brought out in this fourteenth chapter of Job. If we cut a tree down, there will be enough life left in the stump to cause it to sprout again; “but man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?” Verse 10. This is equivalent to saying that he has no existence. But this extension is not final; it lasts until a fixed time. “As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.” Verses 11, 12. We can here only refer to the texts which locate this time. Peter says (chap. 3:10) that in the day of the Lord the heavens shall pass away with a great noise. It is the voice of God, which at Sinai shook the earth, which is yet once more to sound, and shake the heavens. Hebrews 12:26. And this voice is (the trump of God) that is to arouse the sleeping dead. So Job’s words are equivalent to the statement that at death man becomes utterly extinct, and remain so until the coming of the Lord. E. J. W. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 582.57}

**“Is a State Religion Contemplated?” The Signs of the Times, 10, 37.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation two beasts are brought to view, representing two earthly powers. The first beast, having seven heads and ten horns, the body of a leopard, the feet of a bear, and the mouth of a lion, can be no other than the papal power, and so commentators have generally regarded it. It combines the characteristics of all the beasts of Daniel 7, showing that its dominion has extended over all of the territory occupied by the powers represented by those beasts, that is, nearly all of the Old World. It speaks great things and blasphemy; it blasphemes God and his name; it makes war with the saints and overcomes them, and continues forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty years, when it goes into captivity. All of these specifications are met in the papal power, and in no other. Its going into captivity was in A. D. 1798, when Pope Pius VI. was taken prisoner to France, and the papacy for two years had no head. This was indeed a deadly wound, which, however, in accordance with the prophecy, was healed by the enthronement of another pope, and the restoration of the papacy to at least the semblance of its former power. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.1}

Just at this time “another beast” was “coming up but of the earth.” Since all of the Old World was already occupied, it is evident that we must look to the New World for the rise of this other power. In 1798, when the papacy went into captivity, the United States of America was just “coming up,” and there was no other power then establishing itself. The first president had, at that time, barely completed his term of service, and the eyes of the world were being tuned to this new nation, which was so rapidly and yet unostentatiously arising to take its place among the foremost nations of the earth. Its peaceable, lamb-like appearance has always been preserved, and even the dragon voice (*i.e.*, the persecuting disposition) has been heard to a slight degree. If space allowed, we might go on to show many more reasons why this two-horned beast must represent the United States. This much we can say, that if this beast does not symbolize the United States, then there is one symbol of prophecy for which no place can be found. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.2}

This power is to make an image to the first beast. That beast, the papacy, was simply an ecclesiastico-civil power,-a union of church and State. The State existed to serve the ends of the church, and to enforce its dogmas. The church itself never put heretics to death; it simply decided who were heretics, and then handed them over to the civil power, over which the church had supreme control, to be punished. An image to that beast must be something like it-another union of church and State. All that is required to effect such a union is for the civil power to enforce, under penalty, some practice which the religious leaders declare ought to be observed. This is just what must be done in the United States, if we are correct in our application of the prophecy. And this is what Seventh-day Adventists have for thirty years declared would be done in this country. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.3}

It is well known that for about twenty years a party has been in existence, known as the “National Reform Party,” whose avowed object is to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will “place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.” To show that this movement contemplates “sufficiently practical ends,” the leaders make no secret of the fact that the observance of Sunday is one of the “Christian institutions” which they desire to see enforced by the laws of the State, declaring that when the desired amendment shall be obtained, no one who violates the Sunday shall be eligible to any office. They openly declare, also, that the State should exist only as the servant of the church, to carry out its decrees. When, therefore, a national Sunday law shall have become an actual fact, the image to be papal beast will be fairly set up in the United States. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.4}

The New York *Independent* has been very outspoken against such a movement as this. Although advocating the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, it has deprecated any attempt to make such observance compulsory. We will quote from its pages to show that we are not alone in regarding legal enactments for the observance of Sunday as a union of church and State. The reader will please bear in mind that in these quotations the word “Sabbath” is used for Sunday. In its issue of Dec. 14, 1882, in an article concerning “Sunday laws,” the *Independent* said:- {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.5}

“There is no doubt that much of the earlier Sabbath legislation of this country, the relics of which still remain to some extent in the law, and to a larger extent in the minds of some of the earnest advocates for the sanctity of the Sabbath, was based upon the principle of a State religion, and that Christianity, with its Sabbath, was that religion. This theory, however, has been thoroughly exploded by judicial decisions in later and wiser times; and it cannot stand a moment without surrendering the fundamental principles upon which the American governments are organized. The State has nothing to do with the Christian Sabbath as a religious day, except to protect from improper disturbance those who, on religious grounds, keep it as holy time. It has no right to pass to the breadth of a hair beyond this point, any more than it has to enact a doctrine of God or the Trinity, which the people shall believe. The moment the State exceeds protection, and undertakes the work of direction, it becomes a trespasser upon the rights of conscience, and assumes a function for which it is not adapted, and for which it has no warrant. The State has no right to compel a man to treat the first day of the week as ‘holy time.’ Whether he shall do so or not is for him to determine, and not for the State to determine for him.” {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.6}

To all of this we give our consent; we believe it is in accordance with sound reason and strict justice. In its next issue, that of Dec. 21, 1882, the *Independent* says further:- {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.7}

“The State has nothing to do with Sunday as a purely religious day, or with the reasons which demand and enforce its observance as such a day. Its sole function is to regulate it as a rest day, and that, too, for reasons that apply equally to all the people, and not particularly to Christians, who keep it as ‘holy time.’ Christians have an unquestionable right so to keep the day, and by moral means to persuade others to keep it in the same way, and to be fully protected in so doing; but they have no right to demand that the State shall compel others to adopt either their creed or their practice in regard to the religious sanctity of the Sabbath. It should be enough for them if the State, for its own reasons, and not theirs as religionists, makes Sunday a rest day within the limits of a reasonable propriety. When they ask the State to do more, they virtually ask it to establish a *State religion*.” {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.8}

The *Independent* seems to be a little confused in this quotation, in that it says that the function of the State is to regulate Sunday as a rest day. But whatever it may mean by that statement, it is clear enough when it says that Christians have no right to ask the State to compel others to adopt either their *creed* or their *practice* in respect to the religious sanctity of the Sunday. So long as the State does not seek to compel us to adopt the *practice* of the majority of professed Christians in regard to Sunday, we care not how much it legislates concerning it. To say that the State has no right to compel anyone to adopt their *practice* in regard to Sunday, is equivalent to saying that it shall not *compel* anyone to rest on that day. In this it is correct, as it is also in the statement that such compulsion would be the establishment of a State religion. Again, it its issue of Dec. 28, 1882, in an editorial on “The Sabbath and Railroads,” it says:- {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.9}

“We would resist to the very last any attempt to put the civil statute behind the Sabbath [Sunday] as a religious institution, since this cannot be done without involving in principle the whole doctrine of religion and State. It is, however, not less a duty of the church, and of Christians in their individual capacity, to do what the State cannot properly do, and, therefore, should not do; and that is to enforce the Sabbath as a sacredly religious day, and by moral means, by example, and by precept.” {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 585.10}

With this we have no fault to find. We do not question the right of Christians, *as individuals*, to enforce the observance of Sunday by example and by precept, nor of anybody to keep the Sunday of their own free will. What we do protest against is a State religion,-the compelling of individuals to rest on Sunday against their will. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.1}

But since 1882 the *Independent* has undergone a radical change, and now approves what it once condemned. The issue of Aug. 28, 1884, contains an editorial on “The Working Man’s Interest in the Day of Rest,” in which it says that all legislation which *allows any work* to be performed on Sunday is a failure, and they move to deprive the laborer of his right. This wromg to the working man, it says, can be relieved by nothing but the religious observance of the day. From this article we quote a few paragraphs:- {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.2}

“The net result [*i.e.*, of laws which *permit* any person to labor on Sunday] is to put more terror into toil, and to add so much more of burden to the existence of a class of people whose life is already hard enough, and who, without the powerful arm of the law and of social custom to protection, are unable to vindicate themselves. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.3}

“There is no secular nor semi-secular theory of the day that can meet this abuse. If it is handed over to the amusement, money-making enterprise will only lay itself out on that day in another way, and drive its wheels and push its methods so much the harder as the time is shorter. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.4}

“The only possible protection lies in *supporting by law* and by social observance the *religious character* of the day. In the name of religion a halt may be called, and the weary to be ended. Religion is rest in peace. It is still and recuperative to the body and mind. It keeps a people in their homes, and engages them in a wholesome thought, and it speaks in the name of an authority which is sacred enough to rise superior to the pressing claims and urgency of business.” {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.5}

It then states that the right of the laborer to his rest holds good for domestics, for coachmen and stable-boys, in the railway and the steamer, as well as in mills and manufactories, and says further:- {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.6}

“It is a right on whose recognition the religious observance of Sunday depends. If Christian people will not consent to some sacrifice in matters like these, they cannot hope to retain the great boon to themselves and to the world around them of a religious state. If they consider that price too high, they cannot have their jewel of a well-kept Sabbath.” {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.7}

The article closes with these words. “A religious Sunday gives the only hope a weary world can have a regular day of rest.” {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.8}

We do not give these quotations in order to take the *Independent* to task for its change of base; that is its own affair, not ours. But we give them to show how public sentiment is shaping. When the strongest opponent of the “National Reform” movement, the most influential popular religious journal of the country, favors that movement, it indicates no little progress toward the end sought by that party. That that end is in reality a union of church and State, no thinking person, least of all the *Independent*, can deny. The agents of the so-called Reform Party are not idle, and the prejudice which they have to overcome is only nominal. The friends of the Sunday feel that something must be done since there is no divine command for Sunday observance, nothing by which they can appeal to the conscience of the people, Sunday desecration is increasing rapidly. In their desperation they see no remedy but to adopt a plan which, as the *Independent* says, is the surrender of the fundamental principle upon which the American government is based. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.9}

The student of prophecy and of the signs of the times can see clearly that the time is near it hand when the people of the earth will respond with alacrity to the demand “that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by the sword, and did live.” When that time comes, may we be found among those who are heeding the command from Heaven, to “worship Him that made Heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” E. J. W. {SITI October 2, 1884, p. 586.10}

**“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 25**

1. When King Hezekiah was sick, what message came to him from the Lord? Isaiah 38:1. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.1}

2. When he received this message, what did he do? Verse 2. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.2}

3. How did he feel at the prospect of death? Verse 3. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.3}

4. In answer to his prayer, what did the Lord promise? Verse 5. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.4}

5. When he had recovered, what reason did he give for the sorrow he manifested? Verses 9, 10. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.5}

6. Of what did he say he was about to be deprived? {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.6}

7. What do you conclude from that statement? {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.7}

8. What further reason did Hezekiah give for his sorrow at the prospect of death? Verse 11. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.8}

9. Where does the Lord dwell? Psalm 11:4; 33:13, 14. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.9}

10. Then if Hezekiah had gone to Heaven, would he not have seen the Lord? {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.10}

11. What had been the character of Hezekiah? Isaiah 38:3; 2 Kings 18:1-6. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.11}

12. Then what must we conclude from his statement that if he died he should not see the Lord? {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.12}

13. To what place had Hezekiah expected to go if his life was cut short? Isaiah 38:10. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.13}

14. Was it simply his body that was about to go into the grave? Verse 17. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.14}

15. What did he give as the final reason for not desiring to die? Verse 18. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.15}

16. Who alone can praise the Lord? Verse 19. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.16}

17. How positively does David speak on this point? Psalm 150:1. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.17}

18. Why is it that men who have praised God all their lives cease to do so at death? Psalm 6:5. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.18}

19. Why do they so soon forget God? Psalm 146:3, 4. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.19}

20. If their thoughts perish, how much to the dead know? Ecclesiastes 9:5. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.20}

The texts quoted in our lesson this week are so clear that scarcely any comment is needed. The interesting story of Hezekiah’s sickness and recovery is presented to us, and certain doctoral lessons are drawn therefrom. These cannot be misunderstood by any who study the text. We would notice, in the first place, the popular fallacy that peace of mind in view of death is a sure test of piety, and a token that all is well with the departing one. We are told concerning the wicked that “there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm” (Psalm 73:4); and in the lesson we find that righteous Hezekiah “wept sore” when he heard that he must soon die. While all good persons do not express deep sorrow, as did Hezekiah, we have no example in the Bible of one who expressed anything like joy at the prospect of death. Without exception, the Bible writers looked upon death as something to be dreaded. It is represented as an enemy; and Solomon could find no better example of cruelty than the grave: “Cruel as the grave.” Cant. 8:6. Why, then, should it not be feared? {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.21}

The modern popular ideas of death are all upset by the statements of the Bible. We are taught that death is a friend, and that “‘tis but the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms.” If this were true, death would indeed be a friend; but it is positively false. Hezekiah’s grief was entirely consistent with his previous upright and godly life, for, said he, “I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living.” “For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth.” Instead of death being the voice of Jesus, calling his loved ones to his arms, it is the cruel weapons of Satan, with which he seeks to destroy the human race, and deprive them of all happiness and good. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.22}

“I said in the cutting off of my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave; I am deprived of the residue of my years.” Isaiah 38:10. Even if it were true that good men go to Heaven as soon as they die, this language shows plainly that Hezekiah knew nothing of any such doctrine. He regarded death as the cutting off of his days, the deprivation of the residue of his years, and not a lengthening of his existence to all eternity. The language that he used is utterly inconsistent with the idea of continued existence after death. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.23}

Without doubt many whose attention is specially called to the chapter relating the story of Hezekiah’s illness and recovery, will query in regard to the sign that was given him by the Lord. We have no explanation to offer; we do not think that one is needed. There are some who think to rid the sign of the appearance of a miracle by saying that the shadow went backward on account of the extraordinary refraction of the sun’s rays. They do not seem to think that this would also require miraculous interposition. For our part, it is no more difficult to believe that God could, if necessary, move the sun itself backward, than to believe that he could cause it to stand still, or created it in the beginning. We have no sympathy with that spirit which attempts to bring the acts of an infinite God within the comprehension of a finite mind. That which is necessary for us to understand,-our duty to God and our fellows, and the blessings promised to the obedient, are clearly set forth in the word. To these things we should give earnest and reverent heed, and pray the Lord to increase our faith. E. J. W. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 596.24}

**“Seventh-day Keepers and the Teaching of the Apostles” The Signs of the Times, 10, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

The above is the heading of a short article which appeared in the *Advance* not long ago, and which a subscriber wishes us to notice, as it is being circulated quite extensively, and is considered by many to be a fatal blow to the teachings of Seventh-day Adventists. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to state that the “Teaching of the Apostles” does not refer to that found in the New Testament, but to a recently discovered document bearing that title. We will give the *Advance’s* article entire, and then proceed to make such comments as may seem necessary. We will first say, however, by way of preface, that the number of Sabbath-keeping churches, ministers, and people, as given by the *Advance* is too small. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.1}

“The Seventh-day keepers in this country, composed of Adventists and Baptists, number 761 churches, 270 ministers, and 25,780 members; and they claim to be rapidly increasing. The Adventists are much larger body. The recently discovered ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles’ will sooner or later weaken, or annihilate, the view that the seventh day is still the sacred one of the week. Its fourteenth chapter begins thus: ‘But on the Lord’s day do ye assemble and break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure.’ This is a direction to observe the Lord’s supper on the Lord’s day. Was that day the seventh or the first day of the week? Much depends upon the answer. First, all must admit, according to Acts 20:7, that disciples at Troas, with the apostle Paul, assembled on the first day of the week to ‘break bread,’ to observe the Lord’s supper; and that they chose the first day of the week out of the whole seven during which they were there together. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.2}

“Second, all admit, who know the case, that, according to Justin Martyr, a reliable witness, the Christians were accustomed to hold religious services and observe the Lord’s supper, on Sunday of each week, which was the first day, called ‘Sunday’ by Justin, because that was the Roman name, and he was addressing the Roman Emperor and Senate. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.3}

“Two things, then, are fixed: First, that the primitive Christians of the apostolic age observed the Lord’s supper on the first day of the week; second, it is fixed by the ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles’ that that first day was the ‘Lord’s day.’ As a deduction, a third thing is fixed, that the apostle John, when he said he ‘was in the spirit on the Lord’s day,’ meant that it was on the first day of the week. The day bearing the sacred name of the Lord Jesus was certainly the *sacred* day at that time. This all agrees with a great amount of other evidence, too much to be here presented. It all tends strongly to make keepers of the seventh change their observance to the first day, and to make keepers of the first day more confident of their position than heretofore.” {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.4}

But very little mention has been made in the SIGNS concerning this so-called “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” and we will therefore state a few facts in order that our readers may know the truth of the matter, and understand just how much effect it has on the teaching of Seventh-day Adventists. We are the more anxious to do this because the “Teaching” has been widely circulated, and has received an immense amount of attention from religious journals since its discovery. Indeed its discovery has created a great furor in the religious world. The New York *Independent* regard it as “by all odds the most important writing, exterior to the New Testament, now in the possession of the Christian world;” and many other journals and teachers regard it as inferior to the New Testament. It is very certain that since the “Teaching” was discovered, religious journals have devoted more attention to it than they commonly do to the Bible itself. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.5}

The document itself is a portion of a Greek manuscript that was discovered in the monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre, in Constantinople, by Philotheos Bryennios, bishop of Nicomedia. Of course it is not claimed even by the most enthusiastic supporters of the “Teaching” that it was written by the apostles themselves. Learned men are divided in their opinion as to a date, some placing it as early as the beginning of the second century, and others claiming that it was composed no earlier than the third or fourth century. In the absence of any positive proof for a date, and to save controversy, we are willing to grant that it was written at the earliest date claimed for it, in the second century. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.6}

The first question that will now rise in the minds of many will be, “Why should we take this document as an exponent of the belief and teaching of the apostles, rather than the writings of the apostles themselves?” And such a question would be very pertinent. It seems far more reasonable that we should go to the well authenticated writings of the apostles, to find their doctrine, than that we should appeal to the production of some unknown writer who did not even live contemporaneously with them. If I wish to become acquainted with the teachings of John Wesley, I go to his own works, instead of taking up what some anonymous writer may have said concerning his doctrine. So we should go to the New Testament to ascertain what was the “teaching” of the apostles. The whole affair looks as though there was a case to be sustained that could not be sustained by an appeal to the real teaching of the apostles. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.7}

But before we proceed further to impeach a witness, we will hear his testimony. The fourteenth chapter entire is as follows:- {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.8}

“Coming together on the Lord’s day break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with his fellow approach with you until they be reconciled, lest your sacrifice be profane, for this is the sacrifice spoken of by the Lord: In every place and time bring to me a clean sacrifice, for I am a great king said the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.” {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.9}

It will be noticed that no clue is here given as to what day is referred to by the term “Lord’s day.” That most important matter is left out entirely. How, then, can this passage be made to do service in the Sunday cause? Easily enough; all that has to be done is to *assume* that the day here referred to is Sunday, and presto, the thing is accomplished, and we have “strong evidence” to prove that Sunday is the Sabbath. Concerning this assumption as made in the quotation from the *Advance*, we shall speak hereafter; we are at present dealing only with the “Teaching” itself. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.10}

Thus far, then, we have found that the so-called “Teaching,” whether genuine or otherwise, affords not the slightest real testimony in favor of Sunday observance; the “evidence” has to be assumed. But this is not all. We have before us, not only the English translation of the “Teaching,” but the Greek text itself. We therefore know whereof we affirm when we say that the word for “day,” namely, *hemera*, does not once occur in the entire chapter. Neither is there any word corresponding to it, nor anything to indicate that the word “day” should be supplied. Why, then, was that word supplied by the translators? We leave the reader to answer that question to his own satisfaction. We have no fears, however, that any intelligent seventh-day keeper will change to the first day on the strength of so palpable and weak a forgery as this. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.11}

When the lawyer told the judge that he could give fifty good reasons for his client’s absence from court, the first of which was that the man was dead, the judge decided that it was unnecessary to produce the other forty-nine. So we might leave the matter here, having shown that the “Teaching” cannot affect seventh-day keepers in the least, because it contains no hint concerning rest on any day of the week. But we wish to pay our respects to the document a little further, now that we are on the subject. Inasmuch, however, as it has not the slightest connection with seventh-day keepers either to uphold or to contradict their teaching and practice, we shall drop the first part of our heading, and pursue the subject farther under the simple heading, “The Teaching of the Apostles.” E. J. W. {SITI October 9, 1884, p. 599.12}

**“The ‘Teaching of the Apostles’” The Signs of the Times, 10, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we found that “evidence” from this document in favor of Sunday-keeping proves to be no evidence at all, being nothing but a stupid forgery that is of itself indefinite. We wish to call the reader’s attention still further to chapter fourteen of the “Teaching,” in order to prove our statement made last week, that there is nothing in the passage which requires the insertion of the word “day.” For this purpose we once more quote the chapter:- {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.1}

“Coming together on the Lord’s day break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with this fellow approach with you until they be reconciled, lest your sacrifice be profane, for this is the sacrifice spoken of by the Lord: In every place and time bring to me a clean sacrifice, for I am a great king said the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.” {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.2}

Now if this document is to be accepted as embodying the correct teaching of the apostles, it must be accepted as a whole. As soon as we discriminate against any portion, as being incorrect, we throw discredit upon the whole. If the above references is to be taken as proof that the apostles observed the first day of the week, and thus mark out our duty for us, it also proves just as conclusively that they partook of the communion every Sunday, and that all Christians should do likewise. The fact that those who laud the “Teaching” the most highly do not follow its injunction in this respect, is proved that they do not attach any real value at all to the document. They will follow it just so far as it seems to support their preconceived opinion; and they find it very convenient to have even a forgery to which to appeal in support of the practices which they are determined to follow. {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.3}

It will be asked, “If you throw out the term ‘Lord’s day,’ what word or words should be supplied to make the sense complete?” Read the passage once more carefully, and you will see. Of what does it treat? Of the Lord’s Supper, and that alone. And what is there in connection with that ordinance, of which it would be proper to say to any individual, “You must not approach it”? The table. And the Greek word for table agrees exactly with the adjective *kuriakeen*. Now read again: “Coming together to the Lord’s table, break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with his fellow approach [the Lord’s table] with you until they be reconciled.” This makes the passage consistent with itself, and also in harmony with the *real* teaching of the apostles. {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.4}

Thus much for the “Lord’s day” evidence. It has vanished into nothingness. Having shown this conclusively, we will now state that even if the “Teaching” did contain the expression “Lord’s day,” and that many times repeated, and even if it expressly stated that Sunday was the Lord’s day, and contained a positive command for its observance, it would have no effect whatever on seventh-day keepers, for the simple reason that such a command would conflict with the Bible. We will also say that we are very much surprised at the modesty of those who made the translation (?) from which we have quoted. It is a marvel to us why they did not make the “Teaching” state positively that the first day of the week is the Lord’s day, and should be secretly kept. Such testimony as that would have had great weight with many, and could have been used very effectively to deceive the wary. If we are going to commit a forgery, we would do it in such a manner that it would count for as much as possible. {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.5}

And now as to the authenticity of the document in question. Its surroundings and companionship are all against it. First, it was found in the Library of the Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre, in Constantinople. Not exactly on Catholic ground, but on that of a relative so near of kin as to merit the title of sister rather than a daughter of the mother of harlots. A section for chapter eight will serve to show the proclivities of the unknown writer of this now famous document. It is as follows:“And let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second day of the week and the fifth, but do you fast on the fourth and on the Friday.” Now here is a plain command, and we are waiting to see how many of those who are almost willing to swear by the “Teaching” will obey it. As yet we have seen no indication of any such design on the part of any one. Nobody seems to have a special interest in this portion of the precious relic. And this again proves our statement that nobody really believes that the “Teaching” carries with it any weight of authority. It simply gives the modern Athenians something new to talk about, and a new chance to exercise their wits in finding excuses for not obeying the commandment of the Lord. It would be impossible to convince the religious world that they ought to fast on Wednesdays and Fridays; if such a thing were attempted, they would immediately ask for Scripture proof. And yet there is more reason for fasting regularly on those days, or even for keeping them holy, than there is for keeping Sunday. If we wish, we could show that the seventh day was regarded as the Sabbath by the one who wrote the “Teaching,” but it is not worth the while; for even it would not make a seventh-day keepers one whit more confident in their position. We do not depend upon the words of a man, but upon those of God himself, and his Son Jesus Christ. {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.6}

Nor does the supposed fact that the so-called “Teaching of the Apostles” is a product of the second century, add much to its value. The mystery of iniquity had begun its work of opposition to God, even while Paul was living (see 2 Thessalonians 2:3-7); and Peter warned the brethren that there should be false teachers among them, who privily would bring in damnable heresies. 2 Peter 2:1. History bears record to the fulfillment of this prophecy. Mosheim, the learned church historian, after speaking of the mystical interpretations of the Bible, which prevailed quite largely even in the second century, says:- {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.7}

“To this great error of the Christians may be added another, not indeed of equal extent, but a pernicious one, and productive of many evils. The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it not only lawful but commendable to deceive and to lie, for the sake of truth in piety. [!!] The Jews living in Egypt learned from them this sentiment, as appears from many proofs. And from both, this vice early spread to Christians. Of this no one will doubt who calls to mind the numerous *forgeries of books* under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses, and other similar trash, a large mass of which appeared in this and the following centuries. I do not say that the Orthodox Christians support all the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the Gnostic sects. Yet that the Christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied.”-“*Ecclesiastical History,” Book I, Century II., Part II., chap. III., section 15.* {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 617.8}

Thus it appears that they who place their confidence in a certain book, simply because it was written early in the Christian era, are depending upon something that is even worse than a blind guide. For even though the book contains nothing positively false, how much spiritual instruction can we expect to gain from the writings of one who will lie for the sake of “truth in piety”? This practice grew more common in the latter centuries, and finally culminated in the establishment of the papacy, with all its abominable practices. Some of these forged documents contained the most errant nonsense, and well deserved the title which Dr. Mosheim has given to them,-“trash.” Others were only slightly tinged with error. {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 618.1}

The reason for these forgeries is easily seen. Obscure persons, in order to secure recognition for their productions, would credit them to some well-known and highly-esteemed person. Many of these documents, as has been said, contained nothing seriously wrong. The weak productions, which, if it had not been for the famous names appended to them, would have sunk into oblivion centuries ago. The “Teaching of the Apostles” is one of these. It is for the most part a poor paraphrase of Scripture precepts, with some human additions, modeled as nearly as possible after the style the Scriptures. The writer was no doubt an inoffensive sort of person, with no original ideas except a few vagaries, and whose worst fault consisted in labeling his platitudes the “Teaching of the Apostles.” There have been far abler exponents of the apostles’ doctrine and practice, who were a great deal more modest than he. Whether this little pamphlet was accepted as genuine at the time it was written, we have no means of knowing; it is not probable that it was by any; yet without doubt there were people then as well as now who were more willing to take their religion at second-hand than to search for themselves at the fountain head. {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 618.2}

Next week we shall consider farther early writings in general, and the right of the “Teaching” to claim respectability, in view of the company in which was found. E. J. W. {SITI October 16, 1884, p. 618.3}

**“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 9**

1. Of what substance did God create man? Quote proof, and give reference. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.1}

2. What was given him to make him live? {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.2}

3. In what part of man is this breath of life located? {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.3}

4. When man’s breath is taken away, what takes place? Job 34:14, 15. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.4}

5. What then becomes of the breath which causes him to live? Ecclesiastes 12:7. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.5}

6. Is man the only creature that has this breath or spirit of life? Genesis 7:14, 15. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.6}

7. In what part of the beast is this breath placed? Genesis 7:21 22. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.7}

8. When God takes away their breath, what becomes of them? Psalm 104:29. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.8}

9. Is the breath of the man any different from that of the beast? Ecclesiastes 3:19. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.9}

10. Of what are both beast and man composed? Verse 20. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.10}

11. In what do both classes alike return at death? {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.11}

12. Is there any difference between a wise man and the fool in the matter of death? Psalm 49:10. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.12}

13. Does David agree with Solomon in saying that the death of man is the same as that of beasts? Verse 14. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.13}

14. If this is the case, what hope can a man have in life? Isaiah 26:19; Job 19:25-27. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.14}

15. If there were to be no resurrection, would man be justified in living as the beast does? 1 Corinthians 15:32. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.15}

16. Then in what does man have the pre-eminence above the beast? {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.16}

17. Where do we find a graphic illustration of the resurrection? Ezekiel 37:1-12. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.17}

18. What did the prophet see? Verse 1. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.18}

19. Were the bones living? Verses 2, 3. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.19}

20. By what means did the Lord say he would cause them to live? Verses 5, 6. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.20}

21. When the prophet prophesied, what took place? Verses 7, 8. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.21}

22. When the bones, sinews, flesh, and skin were all in their proper place, what was still lacking? Verse 8. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.22}

23. What was the prophet next directed to say? Verse 9. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.23}

24. How were the bodies made to live? Verse 10. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.24}

25. Then for what purpose does God receive a man’s breath or spirit of life when he dies? {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.25}

In Genesis 2:7 we are told that “the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.” It does not say that a soul was put into man, whereby he might live, but that man himself *became* a dual being, composed of body and soul, and that the first was formed of the dust, but that the latter is pure spirit. Without entering into a discussion of the subject of the soul, what it is, we are warranted, by the text just quoted, in saying that whatever different elements combine to form “man,” were made of the dust of the ground. When the catechisms tell us that man is composed of body, soul, and spirit, then they must also claim that all these were formed of the dust, for “man” was born of the dust. But the fact is, that which was formed of the dust was “man” before the breath or spirit of life was bestowed. He was a lifeless soul; but when the breath was given, man *became* a *living* soul. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.26}

This conclusion is verified by Job 34:14, 15. The patriarch, speaking of God, says: “If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust.” After the breath is taken away, then man turns again to dust. That this breath may be called a spirit is shown by Job 27:3, 4, quoted in last week’s lesson: “All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wickedness, nor my tongue utter deceit.” Here the spirit (called the spirit of God, because it came from God) is said to be in the nostrils, and that, it will be remembered, is where God placed the breath of life, which is the same thing. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.27}

In the light of the above texts, we can readily understand Ecclesiastes 12:7, where, after having spoken of death, the wise man says: “Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was; and the spirit shall return to God who gave it.” This is no more than a repetition of Job 34:14, 15: “If he [God] gather to himself his [man’s] spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust.” Both texts teach simply this: that at death man returns to his original elements; that which was born of the dust-the whole man-returns to the dust, and the spirit or breath, having come directly from God, returns to his keeping. There is no more reason for supposing that the spirit, as it returns to God, is conscious, than there is in supposing that the dust is conscious, or that the spirit was conscious before God bestowed it upon man, or that the breath, while in man’s nostrils, was conscious. The dust of which man was formed was inanimate; man, after he was formed by the Creator, was inanimate, unconscious; and the spirit while yet in the hands of God was likewise without consciousness; but when the man and the spirit were brought together, conscious existence was the result. How this result was obtained is a secret known only to the Author of life. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.28}

This breath of life is something that man shares in common with the beasts. In the description of the flood we learn that every beast and creeping thing-“all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died.” Genesis 7:21, 22. It is not the possession of the breath or spirit of life that distinguishes man from the beast. In Psalm 104:28-30 we learn that their creation is effected by God sending forth his spirit, and that, as we learned concerning man, when he takes away their breath they die, and return to their dust. More than this, we are expressly told that there is no difference between the formation of man and lower animals, nor in the elements composing them. We read: “For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.” Ecclesiastes 3:19, 20. This language is plain, and no apology is needed for it, because it is the language of inspiration. Let it be remembered that when the wise man says that a man has no pre-eminence above a beast, he is speaking of death. In that event all are alike. Here the parallel ends, for to man a resurrection is promised. In this life man has pre-eminence above the beast, because he is gifted with a moral nature, the faculty of distinguishing between right and wrong, and the power of loving the right because it is right. This the beast does not have. To all men a resurrection is promised, but not to beasts. If, however, it shall then appear that a part of mankind have died as do the beast, without regard to the future, they will die the second death, and then they will indeed be like the beasts that perish, for with that death their existence will forever end. Man’s hope is in the resurrection; but he cannot have a well-grounded hope even in that, unless he seeks those things which are above. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.29}

Ezekiel 37:1-14 brings to view the literal resurrection of the dead. First the bones, sinews, muscles, and skin are arranged in proper order. At death these return to the earth, but now they are re-formed. There are the complete bodies; but there is no breath in them. They are just as Adam was before God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. But at the command of the Lord the breath comes into the inanimate bodies, and they stand upon their feet, an exceeding great army. Some choose to apply all this to the bringing of literal Israel from the Babylonian captivity, but such an interpretation is of their own choosing, and not by divine authority. God himself (verse 12) says that it is the bringing of his people out of their graves, and this takes place when the Lord comes. 1 Thessalonians 4:15-17; John 5:28, 29. And thus we learn that when the spirit-that which causes man to live-returns to God at the death of the man, it is that he may bestow it again at the resurrection, when man shall live *again*. E. J. W. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 630.30}

**“The ‘Teaching of the Apostles’” The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

**CHARACTER OF EARLY WRITINGS IN GENERAL**

The admirers of this document have been led to put unlimited confidence in it, as a production fully equal to the New Testament, because the same manuscript in which it was bound contains the two epistles of Clement of Rome, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the epistles of Ignatius. We shall therefore devote a little attention to them to see if proximity to them materially enhances its value. But first we wish to show the general character of the writings ascribed to the early Fathers. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.1}

In the preceding article we quoted testimony from Mosheim, which showed that forgery, interpolations, and the palming off of spurious writings, were common practices even in the early part of the second century. So, then, however much credit for honesty and orthodoxy we may be inclined to give to the Fathers themselves, we cannot depend with any certainty on their perverted writings. It is impossible to distinguish the genuine from the false. But this need not cause us any concern, since they were not inspired, and, consequently, their testimony is of no more authority on any subject than that of anybody else. When we want information concerning the question of morals or of Christian duty, we must go to the Holy Scriptures-the inspired word of God. That alone is a sure guide. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.2}

In his “Ecclesiastical History,” Book I., Cent. II., Part II., chap. III, sections 5 and 6, after having spoken of the works of several of the Fathers, among which he mentioned certain writings of Clement of Alexandria, Tatian, Justin Martyr, and Theophilus of Antioch, Dr. Mosheim says, “All these works are lost.” He then continues:- {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.3}

“But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They all believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings, the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other recondite, and concealed under the words, like a nut in the shell; and neglecting the former, as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than of searching out their true meaning.” {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.4}

In the next section he says: “It is therefore not strange that all sects of Christians can find in what are called ‘the Fathers,’ something to favor their own opinions and systems.” And in section 8 of the same chapter, after having mentioned several other writers, among them Irenaeus and Tertullian, Mosheim says:- {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.5}

“In these disputants there was something more of ingenuousness and good faith, than in those who undertook the support of truth in the following centuries. For the convenient wiles of sophistry, and the dishonorable artifices of debate, had not yet gained admittance among Christians. Yet a man of sound judgment, who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lacked discernment, knowledge, application, good arrangement, and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as are suited rather to embarrass the mind than to convince the understanding.” {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.6}

This is the character of the writings which contain the strongest arguments that can be found for the observance of Sunday. But we quote Mosheim once more. In the tenth section of the chapter above referred to, he states that learned man are not agreed as to the estimation in which these Fathers should be held, and says:- {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.7}

“To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle pious emotions; and also many things unduly rigorous, and derived from the Academic and Stoic philosophy; *many things vague and indeterminate;* and *many things positively false*, and inconsistent with the precepts of Christ. If one deserves the title a bad master in morals, who has no just ideas of the proper boundaries and limitations of Christian duty, nor clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor a perception of those general principles to which recurrence should be had in all discussions respecting Christian virtue, and therefore very often talks at random, and blunders and expanding the divine laws, though he may say many excellent things, and excite in us considerable emotion; then I can readily admit that in strict truth this title belongs to many of the Fathers.” {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.8}

Much more of this sort of testimony might be cited from Mosheim, who certainly cannot be called a prejudiced witness, but this is sufficient. And writers of this class are they whom we are asked to accept as authority for Sunday-keeping, and as competent expositors of the teaching of the apostles. We beg to be excused. When we can find no better authority for the observance of the day of rest, than they are, we will be our own authority. We cannot close this article with anything more to the point, and more worthy of general acceptance, then the following paragraph from “The Ancient Church,” by Dr. Wm. Killen, professor of the Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. After having noticed the erroneous and absurd expositions of the Fathers, he says:- {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.9}

“It would seem as if the great Head of the Church permitted these early writers to commit the grossest mistakes, and to propound the most foolish theories, for the express purpose of teaching us that we are not implicitly to follow their guidance. It might have been thought that authors who flourished on the borders of apostolic times, knew more of the mind of the Spirit than others who appeared in succeeding ages; but the truths of Scripture, like the phenomena of the visible creation, are equally intelligible to all generations. If we possess spiritual discernment, the trees and flowers will display the wisdom and the goodness of God as distinctly to us as they did to our first parents; and if we have the ‘unction from the Holy One,’ we may enter into the meaning of the Scriptures as fully as did Justin Martyr or Irenaeus [and far more]. To assist us in the interpretation of the New Testament, we have at command a critical apparatus of which they were unable to avail themselves. Jehovah is jealous for the honor of his word, and he has inscribed in letters of light over the labors of its most ancient interpreters-‘CEASE YE FROM MAN.’ The ‘opening of the Scriptures,’ so as to exhibit their duty, their consistency, their purity, their wisdom, and their power, is the clearest proof that the commentator is possessed of ‘the key of knowledge.’ When tried by this task, Thomas Scott or Matthew Henry are better entitled to confidence than either Origen or Gregory Thaumaturgus. The Bible is its own safest expositor. “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.’”-*Period II., Section I., Chapter I., last paragraph*. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.10}

In our next article we shall notice the writings in whose immediate company the “Teaching” was found. E. J. W. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.11}

**“What Constitutes a Christian?” The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago the Chinese of San Francisco had a grand celebration in honor of one of their gods. The *Chronicle* gave a full account of this heathen festival, and of the procession through the streets, which, with the idol at the head, was marked by all the gaudy display peculiar to the Chinese. The *Pacific* (Congregationalist) copies the *Chronicle’s* report, and adds the following comment:- {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.12}

“This is still called a Christian country, and there are still some who teach their children, ‘Thou shalt have no other gods before me,’ and ‘Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.’ What do these boys and girls think as they see the regular sacrificial smoked hog carried in procession to the joss-house, and placed before the idol?” {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.13}

We are glad for this testimony of the *Pacific* as to what makes one a Christian. Not because it is anything new, but because it is in harmony with the Bible. “This is still called a Christian country,” it says. Why? Because parents still teach their children the commandments of God. A more direct and truthful statement of the case could not have been made. Let us see how well it is sustained by the Scriptures. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.14}

The definition of Christian as “one who believes the doctrine of Christ,” will be accepted by all. He said, “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.” John 15:10. That these commandments are not something peculiar to Christ, and distinct from the Father’s law, we learn from John 17:14, where Christ says to the Father, “I have given them thy word;” and again: “My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.” John 7:16; and yet again from John 6:38: “For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” From these declarations we should understand that Christ came to declare the righteousness of God’s law, and to enable men to obey it. In this he set the example, and whosoever walks as he walked, *i.e.*, keeps the commandments of God, is a Christian. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.15}

This conclusion is verified by Christ’s statement concerning the law, in the sermon on the mount. “Think not,” he says, “that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.” Matthew 5:17-19. Some affect to understand from verse 19 that breakers of the law may gain an entrance into Heaven, but that they will occupy a low place; but that is not the meaning of the text. The true force of the verse is grasped by Dr. Clarke, who says: {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 632.16}

“He who by his mode of *acting, speaking*, or *explaining*, the words of God, sets the holy precept aside, or explains away its force or meaning, shall be called least-shall have *no place* in the kingdom of Christ here, nor in the kingdom of glory above. That this is the meaning of these words is evident enough from the following verse.” {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 633.1}

Christ, then, kept and taught the commandments and he expressly declares, what the *Pacific* implies, that none who do otherwise can be followers of him. “Why call ye the Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?” Luke 7:46. Now read a few testimonies from the apostles. John says: “He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.” 1 John 2:6. Peter contrasts the frailty of man with the enduring nature of the word of God, saying that all flesh shall wither as the grass, “But the word of the Lord endureth forever.” “And this,” he says, “is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.” 1 Peter 1:25. The gospel, then, proclaims the righteousness and stability of God’s law. How could it be otherwise? The gospel brings the good news of pardon for sin. But sin is the transgression of the law, and the very act of announcing a pardon bears witness to the existence of the law; for without the law there can be no transgression, and consequently no necessity for pardon. To offer a pardon to a man after the abolition of law which condemned him, would be an insult. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 633.2}

As the gospel of Christ peaches obedience to the law, so it carries with it that assistance which makes it possible for man to keep the law. Paul says: “For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh [it could not justify a sinner], God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness [requirement, or precept] of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” Romans 8:3, 4. All these witnesses agree that a Christian is one who follows Christ in obeying the commandments of God, using the strength which Christ bestows. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 633.3}

One more testimony we will add. Paul, as the representative of the Christian ministry, says: “Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” 2 Corinthians 5:20, 21. What is it to be made “the righteousness of God”? If “all *un*righteousness is sin” (1 John 5:17), then righteousness is the exact opposite of sin; but “sin is the transgression of the law,” and therefore righteousness is the keeping of the law. So then 2 Corinthians 5:21 simply states that Christ’s work was in order that we might be brought into perfect harmony with the law of God. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 633.4}

It is true that the *Pacific* did not mention the entire law as requisite to constitute one a Christian; it only mentioned the first and second precepts of the law. But we recall the Saviour’s words, that “it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” Luke 16:17. Also the words of James: “For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.” James 2:11. The *Pacific* will, no doubt, readily admit that the keeping of these two commandments (the sixth and seventh) is as necessary to protect Christianity as is the keeping of the first and second. Very well, then we will try again: For he that said, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” and “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image,” said also, “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but *the seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in IT thou shalt not do any work.” Now if thou make no graven image nor worship any false god, yet if thou labor on the seventh day, thou art become a transgressors of the law. The law being a unit, incapable of being divided, we cannot see why keeping and teaching the fourth commandment is not as necessary to constitute one a perfect Christian as is the keeping of the first or second. Will the *Pacific* accept this conclusion, and act accordingly? If not, why not? E. J. W. {SITI October 23, 1884, p. 633.5}

**“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

**LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 22**

1. What is the meaning of the word “immortal”? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.1}

2. Quote three texts which prove positively that man is not immortal. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.2}

3. Who alone has immortality? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.3}

4. May man ever become immortal? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.4}

5. What must he do in order to receive immortality? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.5}

6. Can we earn immortality, or do we receive it as a gift? Give proof. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.6}

7. Where must we look for immortality? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.7}

8. Can you prove from the Bible that eternal life will not be given to the wicked? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.8}

9. For what purpose did Christ come to earth? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.9}

10. Who alone does Christ say have everlasting life? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.10}

11. In what sense do we have it now? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.11}

12. When shall we come into possession of it? Give proof. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.12}

13. In the Bible, by what figure are the dead often represented? Give instances. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.13}

14. In what place are they asleep? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.14}

15. Until what time do they sleep? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.15}

16. Is there any business carried on in the grave? Quote proof. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.16}

17. Do the dead know what their friends on earth are doing? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.17}

18. Do any of the dead praise the Lord? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.18}

19. State in Bible language just how much the dead do know. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.19}

20. At what point of time do men thus lose all consciousness? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.20}

21. From what does this breath of life come? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.21}

22. To whom does it return at death? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.22}

23. What is the difference, if any, between the breath of man and that a beast? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.23}

24. Of what is man composed? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.24}

25. To what does he return at death? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.25}

26. What is the difference between the death of man and that a beast? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.26}

27. Then what is it that makes a man’s life so much more valuable than that of a beast? {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.27}

28. Give two texts of Scripture that you have already learned, which prove that man can derived no benefit from praying to the Virgin Mary. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.28}

The lesson for this week being a review of the subject of immortality, it will be in place to make the notes of a general nature. From our previous study we have learned that the terms “immortal” and “immortality” do not occur in the Bible so frequently as is so commonly supposed. In hymns and sermons and essays we find such expressions as “immortal soul,” “immortal spirit,” “undying spirit,” “death blessed soul,” “the immortal part of man,” etc., very frequently. In the Bible we look for them in vain. Query: If the Bible does not contain any of these expressions, by what authority do Christian teachers use them? Where are we to look for information concerning the nature of man? Shall we look to our own experience and observation? That would lead us to conclude that man is mortal, for we see death on all sides. We do not need the words of inspiration to convince us that man’s life is “even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away.” Death and decay are the lot of all earthly beings. If we turn history, we find that such has ever been the case. The biographies of all men end with the statement, “And he died.” Shall we go to the heathen authors? If we do we shall find them contradicting one another, one affirming that man has a principle within him that cannot be destroyed, another declaring that death ends all; and by this very diversity of opinion they proclaim their own ignorance of the subject. And yet these very heathen “philosophers” are the ones to whom Christianity is indebted for its dogma of inherit immortality. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.29}

It is indeed strange that professed followers of Christ should turn from the statements of “holy men of God,” who “spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” to the conjectures of men who “when they knew God, glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened;” to those who, while professing themselves to be wise, became fools; who, because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, were given over “to a mind avoid of judgment.” Yet this is what is done. The words of Plato and Socrates are preferred above those of Job, Isaiah, David, Luke, Peter, and Paul. For when we turn to Holy Writ, where alone wisdom dwells, we find no record of “the immortal part of man,” but perfect unanimity in declaring that “it is appointed unto man once to die,” that there is no man that liveth that can deliver his soul from the hand of the grave, and that God only hath immortality. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.30}

If we look for the origin of the anti-scriptural doctrine of natural immortality, we find that it sprung from the mind of Satan, the father of lies. The archdeceiver said to the mother of the race: “Ye shall not surely die,” but “ye shall be as gods,” or, as God. The same trait that prompted the acceptance of this doctrine, has perpetuated it. Vanity, love of self, is that to which Satan has deceived the world. It was flattering to Eve’s vanity to be told that she had the principles of life within herself, so that she could maintain her own existence as well as God can. It was for this reason that heathen philosophers seized upon the idea, and is largely for this reason that the Catholic Church adopted it from them. From the Catholic Church, Protestant bodies have received it as a sacred legacy. When we realize the practical effect of the doctrine-to make one self-confident, and regardless of God as the Author of life, and of Christ, as the one through whom it is vouchsafed to man, we can understand something of the far-reaching policy of Satan. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.31}

There are but a few Catholic abominations for which this dogma is not responsible. Out of it grew purgatory, and the sale of indulgences, by which the pope of Rome waxed rich at the expense of the purses and the morals of the people of Europe. Without that doctrine, the worship of so-called saints, and of the Virgin Mary, would find no place in the Catholic Church. And Spiritualism, that masterpiece of deception, would make no headway but for the prevalence of the belief that departed ones are not really dead. It is a fact that so long as Protestants hold to the doctrine of inherent immortality, they have no weapon with which to successfully meet the errors of Catholicism, or the deceptions of Spiritualism. But the unlearned peasant, who relies on the Bible as God’s holy word, and who understands its simple and harmonious truths, may, with the help of God, withstand the assaults of learned prelates or blasphemous infidels. E. J. W. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 646.32}

**“The ‘Teaching of the Apostles’” The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

**COMPANY IN WHICH IT WAS FOUND**

Last week we quoted some testimony to show the untrustworthy character of the writings ascribed to the Fathers in general; in this article we propose to examine the character of those particular writings whose reflected light add so much to the so-called “Teaching of the Apostles.” These are the two epistles of Clement of Rome, the “Epistle of Barnabas,” and the “Epistles of Ignatius.” The first in order is Clement of Rome. Of him Mosheim says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.1}

“Next after the apostles, Clement, bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation as one of the writers of this century. The accounts we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are for the most part uncertain. There are still extant two epistles to the Corinthians, bearing his name, written in Greek; of these, it is generally supposed that the first is genuine, and that the second is falsely palmed upon the holy man by some deceiver. Yet even the first epistle seems to have been corrupted by some indiscrete person, who was sorry to see no more marks of erudition and genius in the works of so great a man.”-*Eccl. Hist. Book I., Cent. I, Part II, chap. III, section 18*. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.2}

Of one of the epistles of Clement, Neander says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.3}

“This letter, although, on a whole, genuine, is, nevertheless, not free from important interpolations.”-*Rose’s Neander, p. 408*. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.4}

It will be remembered that “the *two* epistles of Clement” are included in the manuscript which contains the “Teaching.” M’Clintock and Strong’s Cyclopedia says of the writings of Clement:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.5}

“The only genuine document in his Epistle to the Corinthians, commonly called the first, but improperly, since the so-called second epistle is not his, and is not an epistle, but only the fragment of a homily, later, perhaps, by nearly a hundred years.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.6}

We quote one more testimony concerning Clement. The “Religious Encyclopedia” of Herzog, edited by Schaff, says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.7}

“Clemens Romanus, one of the most celebrated names of Christian antiquity, but so overgrown with myths that it has become next to impossible to lay bare the historical facts which it represents, occurs in all lists of the first Roman bishops, but not always in the same place.... Of the numerous writings which bear the name of Clement, most are evidently spurious.... The first epistle is an official missive from the Roman congregation to the Corinthian, occasioned by some dissensions which had arisen in the latter. As it was written in the name of the whole congregation, *it bears no author’s name*.... The second epistle is not an epistle at all, but a homily; and, as is the oldest existing sermon, it is, of course, of great interest. Where, at what time, and by whom it was written, are questions of great difficulty; and of the many hypotheses which have been offered as answers, none have proved fully satisfactory.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.8}

This little item is, however, conveniently forgotten by those who wish to pile up all the “evidence” possible in favor of the genuineness and authenticity of the “Teaching.” For our part, it is impossible to see why the “Teaching” should be considered any the more reliable because it is in the same manuscript with the “two epistles of Clement,” when one of those epistles was not written by Clement, and the other, if written by him, has been grossly tampered with. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.9}

We now come to the so-called epistle Barnabas. It will not take as long to find out the little that is known of this writing. Mosheim says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.10}

“The epistle of Barnabas, as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century [the first], or the next, who had no bad intentions, but who possessed little genius, and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different man from the Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul.”-*Book I, Cent. I, Part II, chap. II, section 18*. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.11}

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says of this epistle:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.12}

“The opinion to-day is that Barnabas was not the author. The epistle was probably written in Alexandria, at the beginning of the second century, and by a Gentile Christian.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.13}

Dr. Killen, in “The Ancient Church,” says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.14}

“The tract known as the epistle of Barnabas was probably composed in A. D. 135. It is the production apparently of a convert from Judaism who took special pleasure in allegorical interpretations of Scripture.”-*P. 367.* {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.15}

M’Clintock and Strong’s Cyclopedia says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.16}

“An epistle has come down to us bearing the name of Barnabas, but clearly not written by him.... The writer evidently was unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has committed a blunder of supposing that Abraham was familiar with the Greek alphabet some centuries before it existed.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.17}

And, finally, Dr. Kitto, in his “Cyclopedia of Religious Literature,” says of the writer of this tract that:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.18}

“He makes unauthorized additions to various parts of the Jewish Cultus; that his views of the old economy are confused and erroneous; and that he adopts a mode of interpretation countenanced by none of the inspired writers, and at variance with every principle of sound criticism, being to the last degree puerile and absurd. The inference is unavoidable, that Barnabas, ‘the son of prophecy,’ ‘the man full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,’ was not the author of this epistle.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.19}

We now turn to the epistles of Ignatius. To save space, we will quote from only two authors. Mosheim says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.20}

“A regard for truth requires it to be acknowledged that so considerable a degree of obscurity hangs over the question respecting the authenticity of not only a part, but the whole of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius, as to render it all together a case of much intricacy and doubt.”-*“Historical Commentaries,” Vol. I, Cent. I. Section 52.* {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.21}

We have before quoted from Dr. W. D. Killen, Professor of the Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. In his book, “The Ancient Church,” he devotes two chapters to the so-called epistles of Ignatius, considering at length the testimony for and against their genuineness. In his preface he says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.22}

“If we accredit these documents, the history of the early church is thrown into a state of hopeless confusion; and men, taught and honored by the apostles themselves, must have inculcated the most dangerous errors. But if their claims vanish when touched by the wand of truthful criticism, many clouds which have hitherto darkened the ecclesiastical horizon disappear, and the progress of corruption can be traced on scientific principles. The special attention of all interested in the Ignatian controversy is invited to the two chapters of this work in which the subject is investigated. Evidence is there produced to prove that these Ignatian letters, even as edited by the very learned and laborious Dr. Cureton, are utterly spurious, and that they should be swept away from among the genuine remains of early church literature with the besom of scorn.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.23}

In chapter 3 of section 2, first paragraph, the history of the Ignatian epistles is stated so clearly that we quote it entire. He says:- {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.24}

“The history of the Ignatian epistles may well remind us of the story of the Sibylline Books. A female in strange attire is said to have appeared before Tarquin of Rome, offering to sell nine manuscripts which she had in her possession; but the king, discouraged by the price, declined the application. The woman withdrew, destroyed the one-third of her literary treasures, and, returning again into the royal presence, demanded the same price for what were left. The monarch once more refused her terms; and the mysterious visitor retired again, and burnt up the one-half of her remaining store. Her extraordinary conduct excited much astonishment, and, on consulting with his augurs, Tarquin was informed that the documents which she had at her disposal were most valuable, and that he should by all means endeavor to secure such a price. The king now willingly paid for the three books not yet committed to the flames, the full price originally demanded for all the manuscript. The Ignatian epistles have experienced something like the fate of those Sibylline oracles. In the sixteenth century, fifteen letters were brought out from beneath the mantle of a hoary antiquity, and offered to the world as the productions of the pastor of Antioch. Scholars refused receive them on the terms required, and forthwith eight of them were admitted to be forgeries. In the seventeenth century, the seven remaining letters, in a somewhat altered report, again came forth from obscurity, and claimed to be the works of Ignatius. Again, discerning critics refused to acknowledge their pretensions; but curiosity was aroused by this second apparition, and many expressed an earnest desire to obtain a sight of the real epistles. Greece, Syria Palestine, and Egypt were ransacked in search of them, and at length three letters are found. The discovery creates general congratulation; it is confessed that four of the epistles, so lately asserted to be genuine, are apocryphal; and it is boldly said that the three now forthcoming are above challenge. But truth still refuses to be compromised, and still disowns these claimants for her approbation. The internal evidence of these three epistles abundantly attest that, like the last three books of the Sibl. they are only the last shifts of a grave imposture.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.25}

Comment on the testimony here quoted must be reserved for another article. These quotations should be borne in mind by the reader. They are valuable, and should be preserved by all who are interested in the Sabbath controversy, and who have not access to the original sources of information. E. J. W. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.26}

**“The Mission of Christ” The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

“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. In previous numbers of the SIGNS, we considered briefly the subject of eternal life-that which those have who believe in Christ. We learn that eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ (Romans 6:23), and that therefore none can ever possess it unless they have the Son. John 3:36. The question now arises, “What shall those have who do not believe in Christ?” In this article, and succeeding ones, we shall seek a Bible answer to this question. An understanding of this subject is necessary, not merely that we made be driven to Christ through fear of the consequences of unbelief, but that we may have a proper appreciation of the love of God. We cannot praise God, and his love to us as manifested in Christ, as we ought, unless we understand, as far as our finite minds are capable of understanding, that from which his love rescues us. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.27}

In the first place, we notice that their condition is different from that of believers in Christ. This has already been shown. Christ said to the unbelieving Jews, “Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.” John 5:40. The obvious meaning is that they had not life, and could not have it without coming to him, and accepting him as their Saviour. From John 3:17 some would argue that all mankind will be saved, because Christ said “For God sent not this Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might have life.” Such a conclusion shows the folly of basing a theory on a single text, regardless of other texts or the context. The eighteenth verse explains the seventeenth. “He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is *condemned already*, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” Now we know why God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world. That would have been an unnecessary proceeding. The world was condemned already. His mission was to save as many as possible from a lost world. “God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” Romans 5:8. The tenth verse of this chapter shows that being sinners is equivalent to being enemies; and that is why the world was condemned, because all have sinned. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.28}

God sent his Son “that the world through him might be saved;” there was opportunity for all the world to be saved if they would, but they must comply with the condition,-believe on Christ. And now what is to become of those who do not accept this condition? The verse quoted at the beginning of this article tells us: “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.” From this we learn that if God had not sent his Son, the whole world would have perished; and since the condition of salvation is belief in Christ, it necessarily follows that those who do not believe in him will perish; they will accept nothing from Christ, and therefore they receive the same doom that they would if he had not come. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 649.29}

In the passage under consideration (John 3:16-18), there are two classes brought to view, believers and unbelievers. The first class receive the reward of eternal life, the second class are left to perish. Now since these two classes are directly opposite in character, it must follow that to perish is the exact opposite of eternal life. The opposite of life is death, and the opposite of eternal life is eternal death. That death is what unbelievers receive, we learn from Romans 6:23: “The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.1}

In Romans 5:12 we learn how the whole world came to be in this state of condemnation, on account of which they would all perish if it were not for Christ. Paul says: ‘Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;” etc. Adam was the one man by whom sin entered into the world. The stream, unassisted, cannot rise higher than the fountain, and therefore Adam’s posterity are necessarily born into a state of sin. When Adam sinned, God looked down the ages and saw a whole human race in a state of rebellion, and, consequently, of condemnation; and then it was that his great love was manifested, in giving his only begotten Son to die for a rebellious world. Since the sentence pronounced upon Adam extended to the whole human race, we will turn and examine it. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.2}

In Genesis 2:15-17 we learn that God placed Adam in Eden to dress it and to keep it, giving him permission to eat freely of the fruit of every tree, with one exception. Concerning that the Lord said: “But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” There has been much bewildering comment on this verse, the conclusion usually being that the death here threatened was threefold, viz., “death spiritual, death temporal, and death eternal.” But as in the giving of the law, so also in pronouncing the penalty for its violation, the words must be understood in “their usual and most known signification.” When the words of a law or of a penalty are such as are in common use, no one is justified in placing any construction upon them. Now the term “die” in the text is unqualified, and it must therefore mean simple death. It cannot mean *spiritual* death for the following reasons: 1. Nothing is said about any such kind of death. 2. According to the commonly accepted meaning of spiritual death-a state of sin-the act of eating the forbidden fruit would have been spiritual death; and consequently the penalty pronounced upon Adam for a certain act would have been the condition of the act prohibited! But the penalty was not the act itself, but something that should follow that act. Either could mean *temporal* death, *i.e.*, death for a time; for that would be equivalent to a pardon before the sin was committed, which would be absurd. As before stated, the penalty was simply *death*. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.3}

Right here we are met with an objection. Says the objector: “You cannot take the words of the penalty in their exact literal signification, because they read thus: ‘*In the day* that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,’ and the record says that Adam lived nine hundred years.” Still we say that the penalty means just what it says. If it does not, then Adam had no means of knowing what would be the penalty if he should sin. The objection arises from the erroneous supposition that the sentence has been carried into effect. Those who make it seem to forget the words of Christ, “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.” If God had not so loved the world, the sentence would have been executed, Adam would have died that very day, and we, his posterity, would never have existed. It was not Adam all alone whom God loved, but the whole race whom he had created in him. On account of this great love, the execution of the sentence was stayed, and man was granted another trial. The plan of salvation was devised, and Christ agreed to take the sins of the world upon himself, and rescue man from his lost condition. Bear in mind the fact that God did not revoke the penalty; he merely stayed its execution, in order to give men a chance to accept the conditions of pardon. If none of Adam’s race should accept these conditions then they would all suffer the penalty threatened to him; if a few accept the conditions, then they alone escape the threat of doom. And so when we read that Christ was given that whosoever believeth in him should *not perish*, we understand that the original penalty announced to Adam was that he should perish. “To perish” signifies, “to be destroyed; to go to destruction; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence.” That this will be the doom of all who disregard the love and mercy of God in Christ Jesus, is fully borne out by the Scriptures, as we shall see. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.4}

It may not be out of place to briefly consider the marginal reading of Genesis 2:17: “Dying thou shalt die.” By some this is supposed to afford an answer to the objection that Adam did not immediately die and that therefore the words of the penalty cannot be taken literally. From this marginal reading they gather that the penalty threatened was that the seeds of death, as it is expressed, would be sown in Adam as soon as he sinned, or, in other words, that he would become mortal, and would eventually die. But this does not help the matter at all; for if we substitute “thou shall die,” for, “thou shalt surely die,” we are still shut up to the fact that this was to occur “*in the day* that thou eatest thereof.” The truth is that the marginal reading does not express to us the meaning of the original so correctly as to the words of the text, “Thou shalt *surely* die.” It is a construction that often occurs in the original, when emphasis is required. It is used in Genesis 2:16: “Of every tree of the garden thou mayest free eat.” The marginal reading is, “eating thou shalt eat.” This does not mean that he should begin to eat and continue to eat until the act of eating should be consummated, but was an emphatic permission to Adam to eat. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.5}

The same construction is used in Exodus 3:7, where the Lord says, “I have surely seen the affliction of my people.” Had our translators done as they did in Genesis 2:16, 17, they would have placed in the margin, “Seeing I have seen.” Then, according to the interpretation given to the marginal reading of Genesis 2:17, it would mean that God began to see, and continue to see, until finally he saw. This would make nonsense of the text, yet it would be as legitimate an interpretation as the other. The expression is simply an emphatic statement that God had seen the affliction of his people; and Stephen, in his discourse (Acts 7:34), marks this emphasis by the repetition of the statement: “I have seen, I have seen.” So the statement in Genesis 2:17 did not mean that man should begin to die and continue to die until he should finally be dead, but it was an explicit an emphatic declaration that death should immediately follow his sin. If we should translate this passages as Stephen did the similar construction in Exodus 3:7, it would read: “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die thou shalt die.” This would well express the meaning. A parallel to this emphatic declaration of the death penalty is sometimes heard in human courts. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.6}

“Thou shalt *surely die*.” This penalty was unequivocal and unconditional. But for the merciful forbearance of God, and his love as manifested in the promised sacrifice of Christ, the human race would have been blotted from existence, in Adam. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.7}

With have now found how man incurred the wrath of God; and in succeeding articles we shall learn more fully how that wrath will be manifested to all who do not flee to the refuge offered. The consideration of the words spoken to Adam after he had sinned: “Dust thou art, and not the dust shalt thou return,” must be deferred until we have finished this subject now before us. E. J. W. {SITI October 30, 1884, p. 650.8}