

VOICE OF THE TRUTH,

"HE WHO WILL BE," THE COMING ONE.

"To the Law and to the TESTIMONY: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Vol. III.

Providence, R. I., Fourth-Day, Sixth Month, 12, 1867.

No. 6.

VOICE OF THE TRUTH, OR, "HE WHO WILL BE,"

IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

TERMS—Gratis, unless the reader desires to contribute toward its publication.

To all desiring THE VOICE OF THE TRUTH, who feel interest enough to inform us of their desire, we shall be willing to send it by mail.

All orders and contributions for the "Voice of the Truth," should be directed to

J. H. LONSDALE, Providence, R. I.
P. S. Any person who is anxious to pay for the paper, can remit to us the sum of 50 cents per annum.

[From the New York Independent.]

THE SABBATH OF THE SEVENTH-DAY BAPTISTS.

To the Editor of the Independent:

An article, entitled "German-American," by Rev. Robert M. Hatfield, in the Independent of April 18, 1867, demands a brief notice. Speaking of the Sunday, he says: "The Puritan Sabbath is as effete as the German Sabbath is revolutionary. You can neither re-establish the one nor defend the other. Why not then restate this Sunday question from the New Testament standpoint, rather than from the Old; from Christ's first day, rather than from Moses' seventh? No one observes Moses' Sabbath. Had we not better give it up, and make sure of Christ's?"

I agree that the "Puritan Sabbath" is a thing of the past. It can never regain the power and place which it has lost. I know that the German Sabbath is "revolutionary." It is more. It is unscriptural. It is a breeder of immorality and vice; of religious dearth, decay and death. Nor is it less evident that the "Anglo-American Sabbath"—a compromise between the German and the Puritan—is only a temporary effort to save a part of the one and avoid the legitimate results of the other. It, too, must be as ephemeral as it is unscriptural.

But I have taken my pen mainly to ask your correspondent to be more exact and just in his statements concerning what he is pleased to call "Moses' Sabbath." He says, "No one observes Moses' Sabbath." I have the honor to belong to a denomination of Christians who observe and labor to defend the "Sabbath of the Lord," the seventh-day of the week. Their present denominational organization was developed cotermporary with the Puritan movement of the sixteenth century, in England. Their organization in America dates from the year 1671, since which time there has been a slow but steady growth. The early Seventh-day Baptists of Europe reach back through the convulsions of the Reformation, and link with the Sabbath-keeping Dissenters of Ante-Reformation times, and so back to

Christ himself. It is a most patent fact in history that the Sabbath was observed in nearly all parts of the early Church for from three to five hundred years after Christ, and was only driven out by civil and ecclesiastico-civil enactments; while those branches of the church in Africa and Asia which have never been subject to Papacy, observe the Sabbath to this day.

If we are unknown to your correspondent, because we are not of modern origin, he ought not to forget that Seventh-day Adventists—a body entirely distinct from ourselves, but earnest defenders of the Sabbath—have been developed within the last twenty-five years, and now number, in our own country, half as many thousand communicants as they are years old.

We are not anxious to be known simply as Seventh-day Baptists. But, in these times, when men are pleading for other Sabbaths and for "no Sabbaths," for other laws and for "no laws," we desire to be known as observers of God's Sabbath and defenders of his law. The rationalism of Germany, the infidelity of France, and the ritualism of England, are fruits we pray may not be reproduced in America. Hence, we plead for the supremacy of God's eternal laws, as the only safeguard against such results, believing that the American Church must soon choose licentious no lawism, and debasing no-Sabbathism, or accept the truth that all God's laws in the decalogue are unchangeable and binding in all times, upon all people.

Trusting that you will deem this correction worthy a place in your columns, I remain,

Yours truly,
A. H. LEWIS,
Pastor of the Seventh-day Baptist church, New-York City.

"TIME OF THE RESURRECTION."

In the Sabbath Recorder of April 11th, we have an article on the time of the resurrection, from Bro. "C. H. T."

Now, we can only see one verse from the Bible in Bro. "T's" article, which at first sight, appears to prove, that the resurrection did occur on the first day of the week. Therefore we will give to our readers, first, Bro. "T's" own words in connection with this verse, Mark xvi: 9, And then Bro. Hull's remarks and answer, on the punctuation of the verse, with Bro. "T's" replies, from the Sabbath Recorder.—After which we will make some remarks on this verse, which is "an addition by an unknown writer." And then show, if the verse had been translated correctly, it would not read, that Christ rose on the "first day of the week," but on "the first of the" *σαββατου* (Sabbath.)

QUOTED FROM BROTHER "T'S," ARTICLE.

"Permit us to say, in conclusion, that the simple, plain, and positive declaration of Mark xvi: 9, "And having risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary the Magdalene," would outweigh all that Bro. "L," could say on the opposite, if he had the talents of an angel."

C. H. T.

TIME OF THE RESURRECTION.

C. H. T.:

Dear Brother,—In your argument with A. H. L., on "The Time of the Resurrection," I see that you rely very much on Mark 16: 9.—"And having risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene," &c. Are you not misled here by the circumstance that the comma in the passage is placed after the word *week*? Place it after the word *risen*, and you not only change the reading, but, I think, correct it. In this I hope not to be understood as interfering with your controversy with Bro. L. All I wish is, to free you and others from the influence of what I doubt not is a mistake in relation to the proper position of this comma.

N. V. HULL

TIME OF THE RESURRECTION.

N. V. HULL:

Dear Brother,—In Mark 16: 9 you think the comma should be placed after *risen*, and not after *week*, and should thus read, "And having risen, early on the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene," &c. By this I understand you to infer that the phrase "having risen" must refer to an event which took place on the previous Sabbath. This must be your inference; otherwise there would be nothing gained in changing the punctuation. Now, as this is simply an inference, without any proof, I might be content to meet it by saying, "I think" the passage should read, "And having risen early on the first day of the week," &c. But permit me, as briefly as possible, to give my reasons:

1. Because I know of no MSS. or translation of this passage which places the pause after *risen*.
2. Because I think it would be doing violence to the Greek text, to make *prooi* (early) simply modify *ephance* (appeared), and not *anasta* (having risen.) Such a construction would be forced, unnatural, and without authority.
2. If Christ arose on the Sabbath, as you infer from Matthew as well as from the above passage, then he must have appeared to his disciples near or soon after sunset. Matt. 28: 10. How, then, could Mark, speaking of an event which occurred after sunrise the next day, (16: 2,) say he appeared to Mary Magdalene (9.)

But to give all the reasons why the passage is properly punctuated, would involve an entire review of the "controversy" between brother Lewis and myself.

C. H. T.

TIME OF THE RESURRECTION.

C. H. T.

Dear Brother,—I thank you for giving your reasons for punctuating Mark 16: 9 as you do, which I acknowledge is in conformity with popular usage in English editions of the New Testament. Still, I do not despair of shedding some light on the question, and perhaps enough for you to see reason for somewhat modifying your position on the time of Christ's resurrection.

Let us begin at the foundation. You know the New Testament was originally without punctuation marks. Their presence was the fruit of a later age, and they simply express the views of the transcribers, translators, compilers, or editors, in regard to the meaning of the text. They are therefore, a commentary. To test the correctness of the punctuation, we must for ourselves seek the meaning of the text, independent of the punctuation marks. We inquire what the author intends to say, and

upon our view of this depends punctuation. Now take this rule and apply it to the passage under consideration, collated with the writings of the other Evangelists upon the same subject, and is it not perfectly plain, that Mark is relating the *fact* of Christ's resurrection, and not the *time* of it? Your punctuation, then, must conform to this thought. A general statement will suffice to show this. One writer says that in the end of the Sabbath, as the first day of the week was dawning, certain persons visited the sepulchre, and found that Christ was already risen. Others say that early in the morning, of the first day of the week, while it was yet dark, or at the rising of the sun, persons visited the sepulchre, and Christ was already risen. They confirm the truth of the above by saying, that in connection with the facts just stated, the now living Christ showed himself to certain of his disciples and friends. You see, then, that not the *time*, but the *fact*, of Christ's resurrection, and the *time* of its announcement, are the things stated by the Evangelists. Make, then, this your rule of punctuating, and all is well; and this is so done by the best copies of the original Greek with which I am acquainted. Alford, in his Greek New Testament, puts no punctuation mark until after the phrase *Mary the Magdalene*, and then comes a comma. Schulz is the same, both in the *Biblia Polyglotta* and another copy which I have, as also is the *Vulgate*. I think, if you shall make due examination, you will come to the conclusion to punctuate as I have, or in agreement with the Greek copies I have mentioned, which leaves the sense the same.

You mistake me when you suppose that I fix the time of Christ's resurrection toward the close of the Sabbath. *I do not fix the time at all.* My object in quoting Matt. 28: 1, etc., was to show you that your position on Mark 16: 9 was not characterized by *certainty*. No position, in my opinion, as yet, on the *time* of Christ's resurrection, is so characterized. I therefore no more sympathize with Bro. L. than with yourself. I never yet read an argument on either side of the question which I could clearly grasp with my intelligence so as to believe it contained the whole truth. To me the *time* of Christ's resurrection is a mystery. The *fact* is clearly stated, and the *time* of its announcement is also clearly enough revealed for all practical purposes.

N. V. HULL.

TIME OF THE RESURRECTION.

N. V. HULL:

Dear Brother,—Your kind article, of May 9th, has come under my notice. If it were possible, in Mark 16: 9 to place the comma after *having risen*, then it is "perfectly plain that Mark is relating the *fact* of Christ's resurrection, and not the *time* of it." Then, so far as this passage is concerned, the *time* of the event would be entirely indefinite. It might have been ten years, ten days, or ten minutes, before sunrise on the first day of the week, that Christ arose. But the moment you admit that the first punctuation mark should be placed after *week*, or after *Magdalene*, according to Alford and others, the *time* is as definite and fixed that Christ rose on the first day of the week, as the *fact* of his rising at all.

You generously admit that there are no English or Greek editions of the New Testament which place the comma after *risen*. Then it seems to me that the *time* of the resurrection is settled beyond controversy.

But some one may ask, Why has not some Greek or English edition of the Testament, a comma after *risen*? Simply because every Greek scholar will tell you, that *provi* (early) must of necessity from its position in the sentence, modify *ana tns.* (having risen.) It would be doing violence to the Greek text, then, to separate these words by a punctuation mark.

C. H. T.

Now the question is who is right about the punctuation of the verse. If brother Hull is correct, then the verse will harmonize with the Testimony of Jesus, as to the time of his resurrection. But, if Brother "T" is correct about the punctuation, then the verse cannot be made to harmonize with the words of Jesus, as to the time when he rose from the dead. Yet this will not prove that brother "T" is wrong. But, why not? Because there

is evidence that the 9th verse of this chapter, was not written by Mark. But first, we will show that there has been a question, whether this 9th verse was ever written by Mark, and that too by our first day friends, who believed that our LORD rose on the first day of the week, (for we will only refer to them for our testimony on this question at this time.)

First witness—on Mark 16: 9.

"9. The remaining part of the gospel is wanting in the Vatican MS, but there is no doubt of its genuineness." See Spencer's Greek Testament, on the 9th verse.

Second witness—on Mark 16: 9.

"9. *Now when Jesus was risen &c.*] This to the conclusion of the gospel is wanting in the famous *Condex Vaticanus*, and has anciently been wanting in many others. See *Wetstein* and *Greesbach*." See Clarke's Commentary on this verse.

Third witness—on Mark 16: 9-20.

"CHAPTER XVII."

"AN ADDITION BY AN UNKNOWN WRITER."

"I. And having arisen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary the Magdalene from whom he had cast out seven demons." See Sawyer's Translation of the New Testament.

And thus we see that Sawyer in his translation of the New Testament has divided the 9th verse, from the eighth verse of this xvi. Mark, and commenced a new chapter, and called it the xvii chapter, and says that the last part of this xvi chapter from the ninth verse was "AN ADDITION BY AN UNKNOWN WRITER." And our second witness says that it is WANTING IN THE FAMOUS *Condex Vaticanus* AND HAS ANCIENTLY BEEN WANTING IN MANY OTHERS.

Now our readers will see that there is some reason for believing that Mark did not write this ninth verse, and we do not know who was the author, (except it was written by the "man of sin," for the mistranslations, and the additions in the New Testament, go to UPHOLD his commandments, which HE has spoken "against the Most High." Dan. vii, 25)

And as there is a question about this ninth verse, and as this verse is the only verse in the New Testament which says, or appears to say, that our LORD rose from the dead on "the first *day* of the week, those who choose to build their faith upon such a foundation, will find it a slight one. But as for me, I believe as Sawyer has said, the verse was "AN ADDITION BY AN UNKNOWN WRITER."

Again, for it will be said by some, that we have no positive evidence, that Mark did not write this 9th verse, and therefore we should believe that Mark wrote this verse, for this is the only verse we have in the New Testament, that says, that our LORD, rose from the dead on the first *day* of the week." But, IF SO, we should remember also, that Mark wrote this 9th verse in the Greek language, and that according to the Greek in this verse, it does not say, that Jesus rose from the dead on "the first *day* of the week," but on the "*σαββάτου*," (Sabbath.)

But we will give the verse from the

Greek, that we may compare the Greek, with our common version.

'ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣ δε πρωι πρωτη σαββατου εφ' αναη πρωτον Μαρια τη Μαγδαληνη, αφ' ης εκβεβληκει επτα δαιμονια. — Mark xvi. 9.

First, by comparing our common version with the Greek, we learn that the words *Jesus* and *day*, which are italicised in this verse, (as all may see,) are not in the Greek, but were added by our translators. Therefore if it could be shown, that the Greek word "*σαββάτου*," should be rendered "week," then the verse would read, "And having risen early" the first of the week, which would be somewhere between sunset Saturday evening, and Wednesday noon. Who added the word "*day*?" But if Mark did write this 9th verse, what right had our Translators to pervert the word "*σαββάτου*," (Sabbath,) and call it ("*εβδομας*,") "week?" Who will answer this question?

Secondly, the word which our translators have rendered "week," is "*σαββάτου*," (sabbath) in the Greek, and the word for "week," in the Greek language is "*εβδομας*," and all may see that the fifth word in this Greek verse is "*σαββάτου*," (sabbath) and not "*εβδομας*," "week," (see voice of the Truth, No 1, vol. ii, on *Σαββάτου*, or SABBATH, "A WEEK?")

But we will give you a literal translation of this verse, that all may see that if this verse gives us the time of the resurrection of our LORD, it was on the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week.

But rising up early on the first of the sabbath, he appeared first to Mary the Magdalene, from whom he cast seven demons. And thus it is evident, if this verse proves the time of the resurrection it also proves that it occurred on the sabbath, and not on the first day of the week.

Now, "permit us to say, in conclusion, that the simple, plain, and positive declaration of Mark xvi: 9," (If Mark wrote this 9th verse.) "And having risen early on the first" of the SABBATH, "he appeared first to Mary the Magdalene," "would outweigh all that" Bro. C. H. T. "could say on the opposite, if he had the talents of an angel."—VOICE.

THE TWO LAWS.

Many claim that the law of God has been abolished. They can read many passages that a law has been done away. Thus they claim that there was but one law in the Old Testament, hence it has all gone by the board. If there was but one law, their argument is sound. But this is a mistake. There are two laws brought to view in the Old Testament. 1. There is the law of God, the ten commandments. This was spoken by God himself, written with his own finger, on tables of stone, and placed in the ark. See Deut. xii, 13; Ex. xxiv, 12; Deut. x, 1-5. 2. The law of Moses. Moses himself spoke this law to the people, wrote it himself in a book and placed it in the side of the ark. Deut. i, 5, 6; xxxi, 9, 24-26. This distinction is preserved throughout the Old Testament. Thus in 2 Kings

xxi, 8, "Only if they will observe to do according to all that I have commanded them, and according to all the law that my servant Moses commanded them." Here is a plain distinction between the law that God commanded and the law that Moses commanded. Again Nehemiah ix, 13. "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai and spakest with them from Heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments." Here is a law that is called right, true and good. It is said that God declared this law from Mount Sinai. Now we read of quite a different law in Ezekiel xx, 24, 25. "Because that they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my Sabbaths, and their eyes were after their father's idols, wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they shall not live." Here is a law that is not good, and by which they could not live. This must be a different law from the one which is good, right, and true. The same distinction is preserved in the New Testament. Rom. vii, 7. "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid; nay, I had not known sin, but by the law, for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Here he quotes one of the ten commandments, showing what law he means. In verse 12, he says of this law, "the law is holy and the commandments are holy, and just and good." Verse 14, he says, "the law is spiritual." Verse 22, he calls it, "the law of God." James ii, 9-12. James quotes two of the ten commandments and calls that the "law of liberty; hence, there is a law in the New Testament which is holy, just and good, a spiritual law, a law of liberty, the royal law, the law of God; and Paul said that he delighted in that law. We find also quite a different law in the New Testament. It is called the law of Moses. Acts xv, 5. "But there arose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees, which believed, saying, that it was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses. Speaking of this law in verse 10, he says, "Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Here this law of Moses is called a heavy yoke which none are able to bear. In Heb. vii, 14, we read of a law of a "carnal commandment," and verse 19, says that this "law made nothing perfect." It seems as though none could fail to see that these different characteristics do not belong to the same law. Now let us see what law is done away. In Ephesians xi, 15, we read, "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity even the law of commandments contained in ordinances for to make in himself of twain one new man so making peace." So of the law of which Peter spoke, calling it the law of Moses, and saying it was a grievous yoke to bear. In Col. ii, 14, we read, "Blotting out the hand writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." Here again the law which is done away, is very par-

ticularly described. 1. It is the law of hand writing. 2. It is the law of ordinances. 3. It was against us. 4. It was contrary to us. This law was nailed to the cross. Now we read of the law of God thus, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid. Yea, we establish the law." Rom. iii, 31. Jesus himself says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. 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."

Thus we find one law written by God himself, which is called holy, just, and good, a spiritual law, law of liberty, royal law, and the delight of the saint. Paul says that this law is established, and Jesus says that not one jot or tittle shall pass away from it, &c. We have found another law which was written by Moses in a book. It is called a law that is not good, a carnal law, law of ordinances, a heavy yoke to bear, a law that was against us, contrary to us, the enmity, &c. It is said that this law was nailed to the cross. From the above we conclude that there were two laws, one of which was abolished at the cross, and the other is to last till heaven and earth pass away.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

—Advent Review.

WHO SHALL WE BELIEVE?

[CONTINUED.]

However, we expect to show from "the fifth book of Moses, called Deuteronomy," that Moses gave a commandment, that his law, or that part of it, which referred to the sacrifices and burnt offerings, (which Moses called "all the words of this law,") should be written, stamped, moulded, or "engraven" upon stones; and from the book of Joshua that "this law" of Moses, was by Joshua, copied, or written, stamped, moulded, or "engraven," upon stones. In the first place, we will give the Scripture, which contains Moses commandment for "this law" to be written upon the stones, and then the Scripture which declares that it was written upon the stones.—As the most of our readers use our common version, we will transcribe from the Douay Translation that those who choose, may compare the two versions.

MOSES COMMANDMENT, TO WRITE "THIS LAW" UPON STONES.

1. "And Moses" "commanded the people saying,"
2. "And when you are passed over the Jordan into the land which the LORD thy God will give thee, thou shalt set up great stones, and shalt plaster them over with plaster.
3. "That thou may'st write on them all the words of this law, when thou art passed over the Jordan; that thou may'st enter into the land which the LORD thy God will give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, as he swore to thy father.
4. "Therefore when you are passed

over the Jordan, set up the stones which I command you this day, in mount Hebal; and thou shalt plaster them with plaster:

5. "And thou shalt build there an altar to the LORD thy God, of stones which iron hath not touched,

6. "And of stones not fashioned nor polished; and thou shalt offer upon it holocausts to the LORD thy God:

7. "And shalt immolate peace-victims, and eat there, and feast before the LORD thy God.

8. "And thou shalt write upon the stones all the WORDS OF THIS LAW plainly and clearly." (Deut. xxvii. 1-8.)

AND JOSHUA WROTE, ALL OF "THIS LAW," CALLED "THE LAW OF MOSES," "UPON STONES."

30. "Then Joshua built an altar to the LORD the God of Israel in mount Hebal.

31. "As Moses the servant of the LORD had commanded the children of Israel, and it is written in the book of the law of Moses; an altar of unhewn stones which iron had not touched; and he offered upon it holocausts to the LORD, and immolated victims of peace-offerings.

32. "And he wrote UPON STONE the Deuteronomy of the law of Moses, which he had ordered before the children of Israel." (Josh. viii. 30-32.)

Thus we have the evidence in Scripture language, that Moses did command to write "this law," "And that Joshua did build an altar, and wrote upon it "this law," as it was "written in the book of the law of Moses." Now as we have the Scripture before us, as we proceed, may the LORD grant unto us wisdom, that we may have ears to hear, and hearts to perceive and understand, the Scripture which we have transcribed for our instruction.

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.

In the second place, they were commanded by Moses, to write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly." But the stones were also to be plastered over with plaster. How then, could they write upon the stones? First, it is evident, that Moses meant by writing upon the stones, that they should write "this law" upon the plaster which covered the stones, and therefore it is also evident, that Paul, when speaking of the ministration written upon stones, referred to "this law" which was written upon the plaster. For Moses said write "this law," upon stones, and Paul says written upon stones. (Deut. xxvii: 2, 8. 2 Cor. iii: 7.)

How then, could they write "this law" upon the plaster which covered the stones? First, if they had undertaken to engrave the words of "this law" upon the plaster when it was dry, they would have broken the face of the plastering, so that the plaster would soon crumble to pieces, and thereby be destroyed, SO then "the words of this law," could not have been "engraven" upon the plaster.

How then, was "the words of this law," of Moses delineated upon the plaster? First, when they were covering over the stones, with the plaster, while the plaster was yet soft and pliable, they could have stamped

"with letters upon" the plaster, until they had written all "the words of this law very plainly," and when the plaster became hard and dry, the letters would look as if they had been "engraven," although the letters upon the stone or plaster had been stamped upon them "with letters."

Or, secondly, if they had no duplicate "letters," to stamp with upon the plaster, then they could have formed or moulded the "letters" upon the plastering, while it was soft and pliable. And thus, "this law" of Moses, was written or delineated "upon the stones," as Moses had ordered before the children of Israel.

And more yet, for if the Greek word "ἐντυπώω," which was the word written by Paul, in 2 Cor. iii: 7, had been translated stamped formed or moulded, as it should have been, instead of "engraven," then all those who read this verse, could see that Paul in this verse, referred to words which had been stamped, or to a ministration which had been formed or moulded, "with letters upon stone." And if the question had arisen in their minds, how could letters be stamped upon stone? by turning to Deut. xxvii: 1-8, and Joshua viii 30-32, they would have seen, that what Moses commanded to be written upon the stone, was by Joshua, formed on the plaster, when he wrote "this law" "upon the stones." Therefore, Paul must have referred to "this law of Moses," which was formed or moulded upon plaster, which was "upon the stones," "the ministration of death" stamped "with letters upon stones" 2 Cor. iii: 7. For the very reason, given by those who think that Paul referred in this verse, to the ten commandments, is that God's law was graven upon tables of stone, and that Moses law was written by Joshua upon the plaster, and was not "engraven." Therefore it is said, "Why, Paul could not have referred to the law of Moses, written on the plaster upon the stones, for they were not "engraven." "Could not?" but Paul did not say that "the ministration of death was engraven" "upon stones." But "ἐντυπώω," (stamped or moulded,) and therefore would read thus: "Now if the ministration of death" stamped or moulded "with letters upon stones, (see Douay Bible.) This shows us, that Paul referred to the very letters which Joshua wrote upon the plaster, for God's law was not stamped or moulded upon stones, but was written or "graven upon the tables," not "upon STONES." Exo. xxxii: 16. 2, Cor. iii: 7.

But it will be said, that Robinson in his Greek and English Lexicon, has rendered the Greek word "ἐντυπώω," to stamp, to impress, to engraven, Pass. 2 Cor. 3:7." Yes, Robinson, after giving us the meaning of the word, "to instamp, to impress," has added, "to engraven," but by what authority? Why, because it was so rendered in 2, Cor. 3:7, in the New Testament, so if the word is not translated correctly in 2 Cor. 3:7, the authority is worth nothing.—But let us take notice that he has given to us the primary meaning of the word, which he says is to "instamp, to impress." If SO, then "the ministration of death was impressed "with letters upon" the plaster "upon the stones."

Again, if we do admit, that the Greek word "ἐντυπώω," may some time be translated "engraven," then it is not proved, that Paul in "2, Cor. 3:7," meant "engraven." For the primary meaning of the word is to represent by stamping or moulding, "to model," "to stamp upon a thing," "to form," "to instamp, to impress." Therefore if our

translators have taken the liberty to put a forced construction on this word, and rendered it "engraven," it is no evidence, that Paul said "engraven." For as the word also means to stamp, to mould, "to impress," there is no evidence from the Greek word "ἐντυπώω," that Paul called "the law of God," "the ministration of death," and thereby contradicted the plain words of our Lord, who had said, "But if thou wilt enter into LIFE, keep the commandments." Matt. xix: 17. 2, Cor. iii: 7.

But it will be said by some one, who believes that "the law of God," is still binding upon all, that it was the ministration of "the law of God," that was done away, and not the law, for, "a law is one thing, and the ministration of that law is quite another thing," and although Paul speaks of the ten commandments in this verse, 2, Cor. iii: 7, yet he must have meant that the ministration of this law was abolished, which was a ministration of death, but that "the law of God," is not made void thereby. How can this saying be true? For if there is now, no condemnation in breaking "the law of God," what difference will it make to us whether we keep it, or not? But the New Testament says, "SIN is the transgression of the LAW." "For the WAGES of SIN is death," (John. iii: 4, Rom. vi: 23. So then, if we believe this Scripture, we must also believe, that both "the law of God," and the ministration of it, is not abolished or done away. But why should we not believe, that Paul meant what he said? "Now if the ministration of death," stamped or impressed 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." 2, Cor. iii: 7, see Douay Bible.

"Now when opponents of the law of God can be made to see that this is the true meaning of the apostle's language, they will doubtless be ready to acknowledge," if Paul here referred to the stones of the altar, upon which a ministration of death, was impressed "with letters," that "the law of God is not abolished, and that they ought to keep it, if they would enter into life."

But when we have, by our influence, lead our neighbors to believe, by our false positions, that the penalty of the ministration of "the law of God" is abolished, we may as well admit also, that "the law of God" is abolished. For if the wages of sin is done away, and there is no more death to those who refuse to obey God, and keep his law, then certainly, there is no promise of mercy and life for them who love God and keep his commandments.

But it is said, that in 2 Cor. iii: 7, Paul speaks of a ministration which was given to the children of Israel, with the glory on the face of Moses. Yes, but Paul does not say that the glory was upon the face of Moses, at the time the ministration of death was stamped "with letters upon stones," but in the 13 verse, he says Moses "put a veil over his face," so that they could not "look to the end of that which is abolished." Now whatever the ministration here spoken of was, it is certain, that it was a ministration given by Moses, with the glory and the veil upon his face. And we have shown before that there was no veil on Moses face when he came down from the mount, with the ten commandments, or when he gave to the children of Israel in commandment, the gospel which was proclaimed to Moses in the mount by our Lord. And we have also shown from the Scriptures of truth, that there was glory and a veil on Moses

face at the time when he gave his commandment from the tabernacle, or worldly sanctuary, and that Moses did command, that what he called "this law" should be written upon stones, and it must be evident to all, that Moses did give a law, which taught the children of Israel how they should offer their sacrifices, which law was also a ministration of death. Now if "this law" or this ministration of death was stamped with letters upon the stones which Joshua set up in Mount Hebal, then all is plain and simple and can easily be understood.

Thus we learn, that if the ministration of death given to the children of Israel by Moses, with the glory and the veil upon his face "was glorious," because "this law," in its ministration of death, pointed to the death of Christ, which law or ministration, was by Joshua written or stamped "with letters upon" the plastered stones of the altar in Mount Ebal. "plainly and clearly," that by the letter of "this law," which killed all the lambs offered thereon. "For the letter killeth," if "this law" with its works, in that it pointed to the crucifixion of Christ "was glorious," how shall not the ministration of the spirit of "this law," "be rather glorious?" as now ministered by us the apostles of our Lord who was the Spirit, object, or end of "this law." For if the ministration of the law as given by Moses, by which we were taught that we were sinners, and under "condemnation be glory," much more doth the ministration of life, or the preaching the truth of the gospel of righteousness by which we are taught that we can be saved from all our sins, without the works of this law "excel in glory." For even that which was made glorious, in that it pointed to the death of Christ, had no glory in this respect, by reason of the ministration of the spirit of the law of Moses for the spirit of this law, which remaineth is not abolished, for it was the death of Christ, by whose blood we may be saved from all our sins, which was the ministration "of the glory that excelleth." For if the works, or letters of this law, "which is done away was glorious," "much more" the spirit of this law, or Christ, "which remaineth is glorious." "Seeing then, that we have such hope" of eternal life through our Lord, "we use great plainness of speech."

"And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished.

"But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ.

"But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart.

"Nevertheless, when it [the heart,] shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away.

"Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty."* —2, Cor. iii: 6-17.

* Query.—Is it liberty to sin, or liberty from sin?

TO BE CONTINUED.

NOTICE.

THE CHART, which is now ready, for those who wish to procure it, is offered for seventy-five cents (75) on paper, and at prices varying from three dollars (\$3.00) to four dollars (\$4.00) mounted on cloth, with roll.

It is about five feet and six inches long and two feet ten inches wide.

It is designed to show that the testimony of the four Evangelists in reference to the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ, is a harmonious one, and that according to their testimony those events took place on the fourth and seventh days of the week.