

teachable mind only asks, "Lord what wilt Thou have me to do?" Much corroborative evidence might be added from the early ages of the Christian church; but we have no space for it, and it is hardly needful, after such a summary of Scripture evidence.

LANDOR.

REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

Immediately after the appearance of the foregoing in the *Watchman & Reflector*, the author of the inquiries sent to that paper for publication, a reply, intended to be "respectful in manner, Christian in spirit, and scriptural in statement." As it has not yet appeared, the presumption is that it will not appear. Hence it is deemed proper to print it in the SABBATH RECORDER:

To the Editor of the *Watchman & Reflector*:

Dear Sir,—Will you allow me through the columns of your excellent paper, to explain in part why I think "Landor" has not answered with sufficient care the questions, to wit: "Does the Bible ordain the First Day of the Week to be the day of the weekly Sabbath?" "Is not Neander right when he calls it a 'Festival of human appointment?'"

1. In your answer, you admit the perpetuity of the Sabbath, dating it from the creation. Right.

2. You say, "The original command does not, as is commonly assumed, set apart a particular day of the week as holy time." I grant the phrase "of the week" is not in the command. But is it not a fact, that the seventh day of the first week of time was the day on which Jehovah rested, and the day which he blessed and sanctified? Genesis 2: 2, 3—"And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Now, this is the day commanded to be observed, Ex. 20: 8-11—"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 do no work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." It was, then, the first seventh day of time that God rested. Upon this day he pronounced the divine blessing. This day he sanctified. Upon this day no manna fell in the wilderness. Ex. 16: 25, 26—"And Moses said, Eat that to-day, for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days shall ye gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." Again, in Luke 23: 56, and 24: 1, we read, "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath-day, according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre." &c. From the above, where is the chance to doubt that the commandment meant the seventh day of the week?

3. That Christ was Lord of the Sabbath-day, I admit. It was upon this ground that he determined its true character, as he did, Mark 2: 23-28.

4. You say, Christ arose from the grave upon the first day of the week, so com-

pleting the work of redemption, and entering into his rest, as God into his, at the close of creation, when he rested on the seventh day. But do the Scriptures say that Christ arose on the first day of the week? Matthew's statement, 28: 1-6, is, "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. And behold there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow. And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye, for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here, for he has risen, as he said. Come see the place where the Lord lay." By this it will be seen, that Christ had risen before the Sabbath had ended. The other Evangelists speak of a visit, or of visits, made to the sepulchre early on first-day morning, but they say that Christ had already risen. The exact time of Christ's rising, I think, is not revealed; and seeing it is a secret, let it remain a secret.*

But you further say, that the work of redemption was finished on the first day of the week by the resurrection of Jesus. Are you right in this? Do the Scriptures anywhere ascribe the work of redemption to the resurrection? Rather, do they not ascribe redemption to Christ's death? See Eph. 1: 7—"In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." 1 Peter 1: 18, 19—"Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot." Rev. 5: 9—"For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." But the words of Jesus, when expiring on the cross, (John 19: 30,) fully settle the matter. He said, "It is finished." On this, the Baptist edition of the Comprehensive Commentary says, "The work of man's redemption is completed." And Dr. A. Clark says, "Through this tragical death God is reconciled to man, and the kingdom of heaven is opened to every believing soul." Alford says, "The redemption of man is accomplished."

Precisely what you mean by Christ's entering into his rest, I cannot determine, especially as you connect it with his resurrection. There is a sense, perhaps, in which he entered into rest after his ascension, when he assumed his office as High

* "The exact time of Christ's rising, I think, is not revealed; and seeing it is a secret, let it remain a secret."

"I marvel that" any of the seventh day "Baptists do not see," that the time of our LORD'S resurrection, is no more "a secret," than the time of his crucifixion.

Now, if we can learn from the Bible, the time when the Sabbath, should begin and end, then by the same manner of interpreting, we can also tell from the Bible, the time of the crucifixion.

But we shall soon refer to the question of the time of the resurrection, again.—*Voice*.

Priest. However, the Scriptures are silent as to the idea of rest, so that any conclusion we may arrive at is merely an inference. You attempt to fortify your position by, as it seems to me, an unnatural and wholly unwarranted interpretation of a portion of the fourth chapter of Hebrews. You apply to Christ words that I think refer to the Christian, where he is exhorted to see to it that he does not fall through unbelief of entering into the heavenly rest. Mr. Barnes says, on the ninth verse, "It cannot mean the Christian Sabbath, for the object is not to prove that there is such a day to be observed; and his reasoning about being excluded from it by unbelief, and by hardening the heart, would be irrelevant." Dr. A. Clark, on verse ten, says, "The man who has believed in Christ Jesus has entered into his rest, the state of happiness which he has provided, and which is the forerunner of eternal glory." See also at length the Baptist edition of the Comprehensive Commentary.

5. Does not Col. 2: 16, if it refers to the weekly Sabbath, as well as to the annual Sabbaths of the Jews, classed with meats and drinks in their institution, prove too much for your cause, seeing you admit the binding obligation of the fourth commandment upon Christians? The Sabbaths mentioned in the text, as well as the meats, drinks, feasts, and holy days are abolished; but the weekly Sabbath, according to your theory, is not abolished.

6. You say that Christ after his resurrection, repeatedly showed himself to his disciples on the first day of the week. It is true, that on the day in the morning of which his resurrection was announced, he appeared, at various times and under different circumstances, to certain of his disciples. In the morning, he appeared to the women who visited the sepulchre. In the afternoon, he made himself known to two of his disciples at Emmaus, a little, village seven and a half miles from Jerusalem; and in the evening, to "the eleven as they sat at meat." Mark 16: 14. But did he appear to these disciples to inform them of any sacredness attaching to the day of his resurrection? Surely not. His mission was to convince them of the fact of his resurrection. *I marvel that Baptists do not see, that the facts of Christ's death and resurrection are symbolized in Baptism, and the effect of his death, which is our redemption, commemorated by the Lord's Supper.*

But you proceed to say, that "eight days after, (John 20: 26,) that is according to the known Jewish method of reckoning time, on the first day of the following week, he appeared to them again." But the text in John (20: 26) reads not, "eight days after," but "after eight days." Seeing, then, there are but seven days in a week, how could "after eight days" be the next first day of the week? This, however, you explain, by saying it agrees with a known Jewish method of reckoning time. The authority for this statement, I have never seen, but have seen what seems strongly against it. Matthew and Mark, speaking of Christ's transfiguration, say, "After six days Jesus taketh with him Peter and James and John," &c.;

but Luke when speaking of the same event, says, "And about eight days after," &c. Now if "after six days," according to Matthew and Mark, is, according to Luke, "about an eight days," how can days, or a week?

7. Again you say, when they were all assembled on the day of Pentecost, which coincided that year with the first day of the week, "He sent down upon them the promised gift of the Spirit." But is it certain that Pentecost fell that year upon the first day of the week? Hackett, in his Commentary on Acts, says, "It is generally supposed that this Pentecost, signaled by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday." See also Olshausen to the same effect.

8. Again you say, "On the first day of the week, the disciples at Troas came together to break bread." You refer to Acts 20: 7. But if you turn to the text, and read it with its context, you will see that the meeting was held in the night part of the first day of the week, and that the bread was not broken until after midnight. After the breaking of the bread, Paul resumed his speech, which he continued until break of day, "and so he departed." But commentators, you are aware, are not agreed as to whether this meeting was held on the evening of the seventh day, or rather the evening following the seventh day, or the evening following the first day. Hackett says this meeting might have been held on Saturday night, in which case Paul pursued his journey on the first day of the week. But, at least, it is certain that the meeting was held in the night, and for altogether another purpose than that of Sabbathizing. Besides, the time of bread-breaking is not fixed in the Scriptures, and therefore is not a necessary part of the duties of the Sabbath. Indeed, unless I am misinformed, the breaking of bread, in many instances, was with the early Christians a daily habit, as in Acts 2: 42-46, where the daily breaking of bread is mentioned. See also this subject as treated by Neander, in his "Planting and Training of the Church," pages 28 and 29. Nothing, therefore, appears here of the idea of a Christian Sabbath.

9. The collections ordered. (1 Cor. 16: 2,) were not on the occasion of any public gathering on the first day of the week, the direction being, that "each one should lay by him (himself) in store." If, then, there were any public gatherings, they were entirely another matter, and not mentioned in the text. B. P., in Kitto, article "Lord's day," says, "The regulation addressed to the church of Corinth, (1 Cor. 16: 2,) with respect to charitable contributions on the 'first day of the week,' is not connected with any mention of public assemblies on that day."

10. The last passage you quote is Rev. 1: 10, assuming that the phrase "Lord's day," refers to the first day of the week. Now what evidence of this is there from Scripture? This phrase nowhere else occurs in the Bible. It is indeed said, (Isa. 58: 13,) that the Sabbath-day is God's "holy day." Christ also, (Mark 2: 28,)

declares himself "Lord of the Sabbath-day." These expressions approach the nearest in form to the one in Rev. 1: 10, of any in the Scriptures. Doubtless, if any day of the week is meant, it is the Sabbath-day. If the Sabbath-day is not meant, then the day (season or time) of the special manifestation of Christ to John, wherein glorious things are revealed, things affecting the nations and the church to the end of time, is meant.

That Landor should attempt to prove his position from statements in Ecclesiastical History, made many years after, when the church is known to have grievously departed from the simplicity of apostolic times, is to me matter of surprise. In this way, what departure of the church from purity could not be sustained? But from Landor's statement, one would think that from the time of John onward, the first day of the week was uninterruptedly designated by the phrase "Lord's day," whereas, the phrase does not occur until the year of our Lord 200. Again, can it be unknown to Landor, that in the early celebration of Sunday in the church, the idea of the Sabbath never attached to it? Its only character was that of a festival, like the other festivals appointed, or rather that grew up, along with it. These festivals had their origin in the church, and at the time claimed no higher authority. Their existence was the fruit of the ideas of Christian liberty then prevailing. Neander (Rose's translation, page 186,) says, "The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a Divine command in this respect—far from them, and the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place, for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday a sin." B. P., in Kitto, says, "Chrysostom (A. D. 360) concludes one of his homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea, (A. D. 364,) however, enjoined Christians to rest on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forgery called the *Apostolical Constitution*, (vii. 24,) and various later enactments, from the year A. D. 600 to A. D. 1100, though by no means extending to all secular business."

It seems to me, dear brother, that the argument of Landor is weak, having in reality no foundation in Scripture upon which to rest.

N. V. HULL.

ALFRED CENTER, N. Y., March 18th, 1867

WHO SHALL WE BELIEVE?

[CONTINUED.]

We have shown from the Scriptures of truth, that there was no VEIL on the face of Moses when he came down from the mount with the two tables, on which the ten commandments were written; and that there was no VEIL on his face at the time when he gave to the children of Israel "in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him in Mount Sinai," but that the VEIL was put on Moses's face after he

came down from the mount, and after Moses had spoken to the children of Israel ALL THE WORDS WHICH THE LORD "PROCLAIMED" to him in the mount. It must then be evident that Paul, in 2d Corinthians, iii Chap., did not refer to "the law of God," or to the gospel as proclaimed to Moses in the mount, since they were given to the children of Israel without the VEIL, or before the VEIL was put on the face of Moses, but rather to "the ministration," which was given with the VEIL on the face of Moses.

Again, as it has been shown from the Scriptures of truth, that there was a VEIL on the face of Moses at the time he gave the children of Israel in commandment, that which was spoken to them when he came out from the worldly tabernacle, (Heb. ix: 1, 2,) which words were spoken with the VEIL on the face of Moses. Exodus xxxiv: 29-35. (See Douay Bible.) It is evident therefore that Paul in 2d Cor., iii Chap. referred to "the ministration" which was delivered to the children of Israel by Moses with the VEIL on his face. (2d Cor. iii: 12-15.)

And more yet, for as Moses gave "in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him in mount Sinai" before he put the VEIL on his face, it is evident that "the ministration" which was given afterward from "the tabernacle" with the VEIL on Moses's face, was the added law or "the law of Moses," which "was added because of the transgressions." (Gal. iii: 19, Acts xiii: 39,) added by Moses, (to the words which had been spoken to him in the mount by our Lord.) It was added as "a schoolmaster" to instruct them by "the ministration of death," which was ministered by the priests before them, day by day continually (which was a ministration of the first covenant.) But the object and spirit of "the law of Moses" was to point or bring them to Christ. For as "the law of Moses" was "a shadow of good things to come, and NOT the very image of the thing," for it was "NOT POSSIBLE that the BLOOD of bulls, and of goats should take away SINS. "Wherefore, when he [Christ] cometh into the world, he said, Sacrifice and offerings thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. "In burnt offerings and sacrifices, for sin thou hast had no pleasure. "Then said I [Christ] Lo I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." (Heb. x: 4-7.)

"Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hands of a mediator.

"Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one.

"Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.

"But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

"But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.

"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

"But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

"For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

"And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Gal. iii: 19-29.)

Now, from the above scripture, (Exodus xxxiv: 34, 35,) we have learned that both "the glory" and "the veil" were on the face of Moses when he gave his ministration from the tabernacle. And as Paul speaks of a ministration which was given with "a veil" over his [Moses] face. (2 Cor. iii: 13.) And as the scripture do not give to us any other "ministration" which was given by Moses with "the glory" and "the veil," but the one given by him from the tabernacle, how then can any ONE believe that he referred to any other "ministration" but the ONE with "the glory" and the veil," upon Moses face, when it was given," which was given from the "worldly sanctuary."

But here it may be said, that Paul speaks of "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones." But "the law of God," was "graven upon the tables," (Exo. xxxii: 15, 16.) not "in stones."

But it will be said again, as Paul has used the word "engraven," he must have referred to the tables of stone, on which "the law of God" was "graven." We have said before, if we believed, that this verse as it is rendered in our own version, was a correct translation from the Greek Testament, we should be led to believe that Paul referred to the "two stones," which were "engraven" spoken of in Exodus, xxviii: 2:9-12 (see "Voice of the Truth," Page 16th, 2d column, No. 4, Vol. iii.) But by referring to the Greek Testament (2 Cor. iii: 7,) we have learned, that the Greek word "ἔντυπός," rendered "engraven," should be rendered, "stamped," or moulded." And first, we will give this verse as translated in the Douay Bible. "Now if the ministration of death, engraven," [stamped or moulded,] "with letters upon stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses, for the glory of his countenance which is done away: How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather in Glory?" (2 Cor. iii: 7, 8.)

But by translating the Greek word ἔντυπός, stamped or moulded, it would then read, "Now if the ministration of death" stamped "with letters upon stones, was glorious, or, "But if the ministration of death" moulded in "letters upon stones, was glorious." And here it will be said, how can any one "stamp" or "mould" "letters upon stones."—Answer, no doubt our translators ask the same question, and as they could not see how the "stones," could be stamped or moulded "with letters," they concluded that Paul must have meant "engraven," and then they rendered the Greek word "ἔντυπός," not according to the original Greek, but according to their own opinions. But I think Paul knew what he meant, and meant what he wrote. "But if the ministration of death" stamped, with letters upon stones, was glorious."

Now whatever we may decide about the "stones," whether they were stamped, moulded, or "engraven," with letters, one thing to me is certain, Paul was speaking about "the ministration of death" which

* ἔντυπός, ᾧ, to represent by stamping or moulding, to model, τ, Anth; and so in mid, Arist, Mund: to stamp upon a thing." Liddell & Scott's Greek English Lexicon."

was given to the children of Israel, with the veil over Moses face, and the only ministration given by Moses, with the veil upon his face," was at the time when he came out from the tabernacle. If SO, "the ministration of death," here spoken of by Paul, can only refer to "the law of Moses," or to that part of it, which referred to the sacrifices, and the burnt offerings which were offered upon the altar, and the killing of the lambs and the beasts for the sacrifice, of the altar, was certainly A ministration of death.

And although the service of the priests at the altar in the Old Testament, is not called a ministration, yet in the New Testament, Luke calls the office of the priest, "his ministration," as we learn from the 1st. Chapter of Luke, 5, 9, 23rd. verses. "There was in the days of Herod, the King of Judea, a certain priest named Zacharias, of the course of Abia." "According to the CUSTOM of the priest's office his lot was to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord." "And it came to pass, that, as soon as the days of HIS MINISTRATION were accomplished, he departed to his own house." Again, if the best evidence we have in the Scriptures of Truth, on this question, show that, "the law of Moses," or that part of it, which was a ministration of death, was stamped, moulded, or "engraven upon stones" about forty years after Moses began to deliver in commandments his law, with the veil upon his face! Ought not, such evidence satisfy every one, who has examined this question? If SO, we see no other consistent way for us, but to believe, that Paul, (when he referred to "the ministration of death," which is done away,) referred to that part of "the law of Moses," commanded to be remembered, "In burnt offerings and Sacrifices for sin," which by the death of Christ, was abolished, or done away.

And in the first place, Moses commanded, that when the children of Israel passed into the land given to their fathers, that they should build an altar of unhewn stones, and that they should "plaster them over with plaster."

"That thou may'st write on them all the words of this law." And may it not be well for us to inquire, What law? The law which Moses called "this law" the law, "written in the book of the law of Moses" the law of which "Moses wrote all the words" in the book, called "the covenant," (the book of the covenant which Moses sprinkled with the blood of the first covenant, Heb. ix. 18-20) when Moses built an altar and offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings" unto the LORD. (Exo. xxxiv. 3-8). See "Voice of the Truth," Vol. iii. No. 2, Page 7, column 3 and Page 8, where you will find this law more fully referred to.

* (See "Voice of the Truth," Vol. III. No. 4, page 15th, column 3rd. For according to the Douay Translation, (Exo. xxxiv, 29-35, "the two tables of the testimony," were brought down from the mount by Moses, and all the words spoken to him in Mount Sinai, were given to "them in commandment," before Moses put the veil upon his face. But "if at any time he spoke to them," afterward "he covered his face" with the veil. If SO, if the Douay Translation be correct, the whole LAW which Moses commanded to them, from the Tabernacle, was delivered to the children of Israel with the VEIL upon the face of Moses. But there was no VAIL upon the face of Moses when he brought to them the ten commandments, nor when he gave to them the gospel, "in commandment."

But "this law," which Joshua wrote upon the stones was called, "the Deuteronomy of the law of Moses" or the second law of Moses.—But why was "this law," called, the second law of Moses?—First, Paul in referring to Exodus xxiv, 3-8, where we find it recorded, that Moses wrote the words of the covenant, has said, that this covenant was "the first covenant," which he says was dedicated with blood by Moses "according to the law" (Heb. ix. 18-20.) And afterward when the tabernacle was set up, Paul says, "Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry" or ministration (Heb. ix. 1, 21.) And thus we see that Paul has united the words spoken and the book of the covenant, written by Moses, with the tabernacle and all the vessels with the ministration of the priests and includes them all together, calling them the first covenant, although these words, of the first covenant, were spoken and written some time before the tabernacle was made, or the ministration thereof commenced. (Exo. xxiv. 3-8. Exo. xxxiii. 7-11.)

Now after the tabernacle was set up by Moses he went up into the mount, and saw the glory of the LORD, and heard the gospel proclaimed by the LORD, and also found grace before the LORD, and having received some of the glory of the LORD, upon his countenance, he came down from the mount, and went into the tabernacle. Now when, Moses came out again, for to speak with the people, (the glory being still on his face, he put on the veil to cover the glory.) At which time it is very evident, that he gave them in commandment from the tabernacle the words which he had before written in the book of the first covenant. And thus Moses repeated to them the words of the first covenant written in the "book of the covenant," which referred to the "burnt offerings" and sacrifices, which were to be offered upon the altar, which repeated law, may have been called the "second giving of the law by Moses," which was commanded by Moses to be written upon the stones of the altar which Joshua built.

And more, when Moses gave "this law," the second time, which law at this time was given from the tabernacle, it is also evident, that he would give them the rule or law, by which they should offer upon the altar, the burnt offerings and sacrifices, which rule or added law, would be called "the Deuteronomy," or "The Second Law." For Joshua "wrote upon stones the Deuteronomy of the law of Moses," the very law which Paul has called the "ministration of death," stamped or moulded "with letters upon stones."

I marvel greatly, how any one can believe, that "the law of God," was "the ministration of death." For our LORD has said, "But if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Now if they were "the ministration of death," then all those who keep them, will enter into "death," and not into "life." Whom shall we believe?

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law.—Paul.