

THE ADVENT REVIEW,

AND SABBATH HERALD.

"Here is the Patience of the Saints; Here are they that keep the Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus."

VOL. V.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., THIRD-DAY, JULY 18, 1854.

No. 24.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

TERMS.—See Last Page.

THE LAW OF GOD:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TESTIMONY OF BOTH TESTAMENTS.

BY J. H. WAGGONER.

(Continued from Vol. IV, No. 20.)

Another objection is urged from Rom. x, 4:—"Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." If, because he is the end of the law, we are no longer to keep the law, the declaration only reaches those who believe. Of course those who do not believe are still under obligation to keep the law. Then this would not only prove that the law is still in force, but that those who do not believe are under obligation to observe moral precepts, which the believer in Christ is not under obligation to observe! This is the inevitable conclusion of antinomian teachings. Is it any wonder that infidelity abounds, while doctrines of such an immoral tendency are taught for Christianity? But to show that there is nothing in this text inconsistent with the teachings of the previous chapters, we copy the definition of the word here used, as given by Webster; also of the words fulfill, destroy and abolish:—

END, *n.* Extreme point; ultimate object; design; cessation; death.

FULFILL, *v. t.* To perform; to complete; to accomplish.

DESTROY, *v. t.* To kill; to annihilate; to demolish; to ruin; to lay waste.

ABOLISH, *v. t.* To destroy; to repeal; to make void.

Is Christ the end of the law in such a manner that we may transgress it? The transgression of the law is sin, or unrighteousness; but it is not said that he is the end of the law for unrighteousness, but for righteousness, or obedience. We have shown from the scriptures the absurdity of supposing that the law of God is abolished or destroyed because it is fulfilled; and we would now refer to the following passages to show that *end* does not necessarily mean cessation, or death, but the ultimate object or design. Heb. xiii, 7, 8; 1 Pet. i, 9; James v, 11. "Behold we count them happy which endure. Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy." Now the law was ordained unto life, because it is a just standard of morals; but transgressors can obtain life only through Christ; and we understand this scripture to mean that the ultimate object or design of the law is accomplished in the person of Christ, who takes away the carnal mind, bestows upon us a moral character, and brings us to obedience.

Many have been made to stumble over the letter to the Romans, supposing that Paul's reasoning did tend to make void the law through faith. But we trust that the opposite has been shown to the satisfaction of all candid minds—that thus far God's law stands firm on the authority of the New Testament. But the question now arises, Did Paul, in writing to the Romans, contradict what he had written to the Galatians two years before? We cannot believe that he did; and as he has maintained the perpetuity of the law in his letter to the Romans, in order that the two harmonize, he must also maintain it in that to the Galatians; and in our examination of this epistle, if we "find some things hard to be understood," let us not wrest them to our own destruction, but compare

them with the other scriptures, and thus ascertain the mind of the Spirit.

We have stated our belief that the Saviour and the Apostles spoke of the same law that the Prophets wrote of, because they drew no line of distinction, but regarded it in the same light, as possessed of the same nature, its observance securing the same great reward, and its transgression attended with the same fatal consequences. For the same reason we conclude that the same law is spoken of in Galatians and Romans; that the word *law*, whenever it is used in the epistle of James, or those to the Galatians and Romans, has reference to the moral law of God, the ten commandments, except when directly qualified, as in Rom. vii, 23, 25; viii, 2; and Gal. vi, 2. But the same term in Hebrews always has reference to the Levitical law; the precepts of the moral code being spoken of in the plural, "laws." Heb. viii, 10. That this word [law] is used in reference to more than one law in the New Testament, we have briefly noticed; and an examination of the nature and objects of these two laws must convince all that they cannot be regarded as one and the same, and are never confounded in the sacred writings. As we have dwelt somewhat at length upon the nature of the moral law, we will consider in contrast the nature of the ceremonial or Levitical law.

A moral precept cannot possibly be typical; but is of itself holy, just and good. But the Levitical law was typical. It was a system of types and shadows. The priests under it served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things. Its offerings were remembrances of sin. Heb. x, 3. The priesthood was instituted that offerings might be made to God through them; and the offerings were made to atone for sin. When an individual brought his offering to the priest, it was an acknowledgment on his part that he had sinned; the victim was slain to signify that he, as a sinner, was worthy of death. Thus it is evident that the whole system was instituted to show the nature and desert of sin, and the method of making an atonement for it. But if no sin existed, no offering would be required; therefore the sin laid back of, or existed before, the offering. But sin is the transgression of the law; hence the law was transgressed before any system of offerings was required; and the Levitical law was instituted because the pre-existing moral law was transgressed. A priest serves as a mediator; but if man were already justified before God, he would require no mediator. Had man kept the law he would have been justified—he would not have had sin, and of course there would have been no necessity for a sin-offering. Here the ministration of the priest, and the law over which he ministers, are clearly distinct. The sin must be antecedent to the atonement for sin. The Levitical law being typical, pointed to Christ, and the death of Christ must have been determined before the types of his work could be instituted. The necessity of his death arose from man's transgression. "He died for our sins." But if there was but one law, and that containing types and shadows, then it is impossible to show what that law was given for; and if the moral law that existed previous to the death of Christ, does not exist now, how can he mediate in the new covenant for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant? Heb. ix, 15.

Again, the difference between the two laws is shown in that the ceremonies of the Levitical law were not acceptable while the precepts of the moral law were disregarded. The types pointed to Christ; but Christ came to save his people from their sins, not in their sins, and to cause grace to reign through righteousness, not through unrighteousness. Therefore if those offerings had been accepted of the Lord,

while the person who offered them continued to commit the crimes for which he sought forgiveness; then the Levitical law would not have "served to the example and shadow" of Christ's ministration. The Lord said, "Hear, O earth; Behold I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts; because they have not hearkened unto my word, nor to my law; but rejected it. To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me;" Jer. vi, 19, 20. If observing the law consisted in offering sacrifices, then they could not be said to have rejected the law while they made the offerings. The complaint is not that they had not brought sacrifices and offerings, but that they had not hearkened to his law, but rejected it; and for this reason their offerings were not acceptable.

That God's law was something entirely distinct from these sacrifices, is further shown in Jer. vii, 22, 23: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices. But this thing I commanded them, saying, Obey my voice and I will be your God and you shall be my people." When they heard his voice a few days after this commandment was given, he spoke the ten commandments in the hearing of all Israel. Ex. xix, 5, 6; xx, 1-22; Dent. iv, 12, 13.

The Apostle to the Hebrews says that the law had a shadow of good things to come: then that law was certainly typical. Its offerings could not make perfect, because the blood offered by it could not take away sin. The law of which he here speaks had sacrifices and offerings; but the law of God, the law of moral precepts, does not speak "concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices." Thus, by comparison, we find that two different laws are spoken of in the New Testament: one which is not made void through faith in Christ, which he came not to destroy; and another which he blotted out, and nailed to his cross. One a spiritual, holy, just and good law, the doors of which would be justified, by which is the knowledge of sin, of which Paul discourses to the Romans; the other, treated of in the epistle to the Hebrews, weak and unprofitable, carnal, making nothing perfect, containing mere shadows of good things to come. By the same method of comparison, we are led to the conclusion that one and the same law is spoken of to the Romans and Galatians; and also by the fact that the declarations in Galatians cannot be made to apply to the ceremonial law.

The letter to the Galatians is supposed to have been written about two years before that to the Romans, and on that account might have claimed the first investigation; but many are ready to admit that the Apostle to the Romans reasons concerning the moral law, who will not make the same admission respecting his letter to the Galatians; therefore we have given that our first attention, and proved, we trust, that not a single declaration has been found therein which can be referred to the ceremonial or Levitical law. We are now prepared to examine that to the Galatians, and expect that all will agree with us that this treats solely of the moral law, if an analogy can be shown between the main positions in the two epistles. Two expressions are found in Romans, [Chap. vii, 23; viii, 2,] which do not refer to the ten commandments; nor yet to the Levitical law; but the only place in Galatians where *law* is used in reference to any thing but the ten commandments, is in Chap. vi, 2: "the law of Christ." If this declaration is found to be correct, and it can be shown that the Apostle's reasoning tends to prove the perpetuity of the law of which it treats, then

the epistle to the Galatians may be considered a strong hold by those who "delight in the law of God."

To whom, and under what circumstances, did the Apostle write this letter? His declaration of what he said to Peter at Antioch, some six years before, shows that they had been troubled with judaizing teachers, who did not understand that justification was obtained wholly through Christ "without the law." Rom. iii, 19-23. This is also shown in Gal. iv, 21; v, 1-4, but this does not prove that they were Jews to whom he wrote, or that Judaism was the only error with which they were in danger of being affected. It has been supposed by some that, although this was "written to the churches of Galatia," these churches were composed of Jewish converts resident in that country; but the expressions of Paul in Chap. i, 13, 14, evidently contradicts this. He told them they had heard of his conversation in times past in "the Jews' religion." When speaking of himself and others of his nation, [Acts xxvi, 4, 5,] he used the phrase, "our religion." Again, in Gal. i, 14, he said, "And profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers." This was not his method of speaking when addressing himself to the Jews. At Rome he called the chief of the Jews together, and said, "I have committed nothing against the people, or customs of our fathers." Acts xxviii, 17; xxvi, 5.

It has also been supposed that Gal. iv, 8-10, refers to the ceremonies of the Levitical law, and must have been written to those who had observed that law—"When ye knew not God, ye did service to them which by nature are no gods;" and in referring again to this service he says, "Ye observe days and months and times and years." The ceremonies of the Levitical law were never contrary to the knowledge of God; never observed by those who knew not God; nor was their observance indicative of a "service to them which by nature are no gods;" inasmuch as they were required in the service of the true God under the former dispensation; so that these expressions plainly prove the contrary. But of this we shall speak more at length when we come to an examination of this chapter.

It is declared in Rom. iii, 23, that all have sinned, and this declaration is based on the authority of the scriptures; and let it be remarked, that in the New Testament dispensation the Apostle quotes from the Old Testament to prove that Jews and Gentiles were alike sinners. But this scripture could have no bearing on the point, if the Gentiles were not amenable to the law in the Old Testament. Neither would it be in point if the law which existed at the time the scripture was written had passed away before the Apostle quoted it; yet he has adduced it as the proof, and we are satisfied to rest it there, and consider them sinners on that authority. As Jews and Gentiles are all sinners, the Jew has no pre-eminence, but must come to Christ for justification the same as the Gentile. But Peter "was to be blamed," because he separated himself, and compelled the Gentiles to live as the Jews, thereby building again the distinction which had been destroyed by the manifestation of God's righteousness through faith in Christ. Rom. iii, 21-23; Eph. ii, 13, 14. The remarks respecting the law, in this chapter are parallel with those in Romans. By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. For I through the law am dead to the law that I might live unto God. Gal. ii, 16, 19. See Rom. iii, 20; vi, 11; vii, 4, 9. It might be inferred from Gal. iii, 2-5, that he is no longer speaking of the moral law; but we must remember that justification cannot be obtained by a law, however holy and just it may be, after it is transgressed; and those who receive the Spirit, or work miracles, must necessarily do so by faith, and not by the works of the law. But this argues nothing against the law, as it does not cease to be holy because it does not justify the transgressor; on the contrary, we could have no regard for a law which had not power to hold the transgressor under condemnation. If the transgressor of a law can justly escape its penalty, then the law itself is unjust, and should not be enforced. That which our opponents urge against the law, viz., that it holds men under the

curse, is a strong argument for its justice and perpetuity.

As Abraham was justified by faith, made perfect by works, so we are the children of Abraham, if we are of faith, and do the works of Abraham: not merely believe the word, but "*walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham.*" Rom. iv, 12. The gospel was preached to Abraham—the promise made of a blessing to the nations, because God would justify the nations through faith. So then they which be of faith, whether they are circumcised or not, are blessed with faithful Abraham. Rom. iv, 11; Gal. iii, 7, 9. As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse. Verse 10. Does this mean, that as many as do the works of the law, or keep the law, are under the curse? Surely not. Paul says, the doers of the law shall be justified; and James says, Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, shall be blessed in his deed—not cursed. The law was ordained unto life, but the wages of sin, or transgression of the law, is death. It is because they have not kept it, or continued therein, that they are cursed, as the quotation in verse 10 proves:—"For it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." Compare Deut. xxvii, 10, 26; xxviii, 1, 2, 15; Ps. cxix, 21. That the Apostle is here speaking of the moral law, is evident, as it is a law that not only curses the transgressor, but by observing which a man would live. Verse 12. See Lev. xviii, 5; Eze. xx, 11, 21. From the curse of this law Christ has redeemed us, being made a curse for us, that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ. Verses 13, 14. Two important points are presented in these verses: (1.) Christ has redeemed the Gentiles from the curse of this law. (2.) The curse of this law, unless removed by Christ, stands between us and the blessing of Abraham. That the work of redemption reaches the Gentiles none will deny; but that it reaches beyond the jurisdiction of this law, cannot be shown. This law holds the Gentiles under the curse, because by it is the knowledge of sin, and by it both Jews and Gentiles are proved sinners. But if the law was not given to the Gentiles, we fail to see how Christ can redeem them from its curse. Then the argument may be stated thus: The redemption of Christ reaches those only who are under the curse of the law; the law curses those only who transgress it; and those only can transgress it who are amenable to it, or to whom it was given. But it was a Jewish law, and not given to the Gentiles; therefore the redemption of Christ does not reach the Gentiles!!

We have seen what it was to obey the voice of God, and what he commanded when his voice was heard. Deut. xxvii, 10. Moses said, "Thou shalt therefore obey the voice of the Lord thy God, and do his commandments and his statutes;" and in verse 26, it is said, "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them." Paul certainly refers to the same law, inasmuch as he quotes this scripture, and applies it to the Gentiles. But if any yet deny that this is spoken in reference to the moral law, or affirm that the Apostle includes the whole system of law under the former dispensation, it will be time to answer them further when they show what connection the Gentile nations had with the Levitical law, or what was its curse, and how they were brought under it.

But God has promised that in Abraham and, in his seed, all the nations of the earth should be blessed. Gen. xxii, 18. Christ is the seed referred to in the promise; [Gal. iii, 16,] and he redeems the nations from the curse of the law in order to fulfill the promise, or that the blessing of Abraham may be conferred on them. Some have contended that the law itself is a curse, standing between us and the blessing of Abraham; but this view is contradicted by verse 21, which directly declares that the law is not against the promises of God. It is not the law that withholds the blessing, but it is the curse of the law; and this falls only on the transgressor; therefore the transgression of the law deprives the transgressor of the blessing of Abraham; and this is a strong confirmation of what we have proved from other scriptures; viz., that the law is the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, and that

the faithfully obedient secure the promised blessings. And on the supposition that the law stands disconnected from that covenant, or is not the condition on which it was based, it cannot be shown why the transgressor of the law is not entitled to the blessing of the covenant without redemption from the curse of the law.

If this law had been kept by all, none would have been under its curse; and then no mediator would have been needed to secure to man the blessing of God. When the law is transgressed it is not set aside, neither are they who have transgressed it justified by future obedience. Then it becomes necessary to keep, not only the *Commandments of God*, the great and universal Law-giver, but also the *Faith of Jesus*, the Mediator between God and man, the Redeemer from the curse of God's violated law. In order to understand the Apostle's argument in Galatians, the object of this redemption should be kept in view, which is, that the blessing of Abraham might come on those who are redeemed. The covenant under which these blessings are given, was confirmed in Christ; as he is the seed to whom the promises were made, in whom all nations were to be blessed. Verses 16, 17. This is also shown, in verse 8, to be the gospel covenant. As the promises of the gospel were made to Abraham, he is constituted the father of all believers; and as before shown, the condition being violated, the blessing is conferred on those only who can claim them on the promise of God through faith in the Mediator. Compare Rom. iv, 12-16, with Gal. iii, 17, 18. In considering verse 19, we would refer the reader to our remarks on Rom. v, 20, where it is evident that the same law entered that was transgressed, otherwise it would not have the effect to cause the offense to abound. Here it is said that the law was added because of transgression. What was transgressed? Not, as some have vainly contended, the promise made to Abraham; for man cannot transgress the promise of God, though they can his law. It will be noticed that Paul does not introduce another law in verse 19, but speaks throughout of "*the law*," so we must consider him as speaking of the same law unless there is something in the argument which renders it positively necessary that another law should enter or be added because of transgression. But in Rom. v, 20, it is seen to be necessary that the same law that was transgressed should enter to cause the offense to abound; so in Gal. iii, 19, when we inquire into the nature and office of the law that was added, there will be no difficulty in viewing it as the same that was transgressed. The law was added to serve as a school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified through faith: justification by the law being impossible by reason of transgression. Here it is evident that he refers to the moral law; for none but a moral law could bring us to Christ. He is the only Saviour from sin; and as the sick need a physician, so the sinful need a Saviour. But in order that the sinner come to Christ, he must be made sensible of his sinful condition; this can be done only by the law; for "by the law is the knowledge of sin." So "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;" perfect as a standard of right, convincing of sin, and thus bringing us to Christ, the way of salvation. Such conversion is genuine and complete. Thus it is evident that the law spoken of in Gal. iii, 19, 24, is a moral law, one that will detect and convince of sin.

But it is asked, was the law added to the law? No: "the covenant confirmed before of God in Christ" is the subject of the Apostle's discourse; and it was this to which the law was added. But it has been clearly proved that the law was also the condition of that covenant; neither was it added so as to become the condition of the Abrahamic covenant a second time, but as the condition of another covenant, the blessings of which did not rest on the promise of God through Christ, but on the obedience of those with whom it was made. As they had all transgressed, by entering into a covenant of works, or obedience, their weakness and sinfulness was made manifest; and thus the law brought them to a reliance on Jesus Christ for freedom from the curse which they had incurred by disobedience. Through Christ the Gentiles also receive the adoption of sons, being Abraham's seed by faith, where there is nei-

ther Jew nor Greek, but all one in Christ; the Gentiles being "fellow-heirs, and of the same body, partakers of his promise in Christ, by the gospel," [Eph. iii, 6,] according to God's word to Abraham.

As the heir, while yet a child, differs in nothing from a servant, so we, before we were redeemed from the curse of the law, and received the adoption of sons, were in bondage under the elements of the world, and by nature the children of wrath, even as others. In what respect we were under the elements of the world, we learn from Eph. ii, 1-3. "Were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked, according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Thus we see that to be in bondage under the elements of the world is being in a state of sin, which is compared to that of a child who is under tutors and governors; so we were under a school-master, under the law, which has been shown to be under condemnation. The following expression of the same idea from the pen of Bro. J. N. Andrews, may be found in the *Review and Herald*, Vol. II, page 29:—

"The bondage of the Jewish church did not consist in that God had given them his law, but because they were its transgressors—the servants of sin. John viii, 33-36. The freedom of the children of 'Jerusalem which is above' does not consist in that the law has been abolished, but in that they have been made free from sin. Rom. vi, 22."

We have all been in bondage under the elements of the world, [Gal. iv, 3,] and Christ was made under the law, [verse 4,] to redeem them that were under the law, [verse 5,] and God hath given us the spirit of his Son; [verse 6,] wherefore we are no longer bond-men, but sons and heirs through Christ. Verse 7. The expression in verse 8, as we have shown, does not refer to the Levitical law. As that law was not contrary to the knowledge of God, it was never observed by those who had not the knowledge of God; its observance did not indicate "service to them which by nature are no gods," but was required in the service of the true God under the former covenant. Then it is evident that turning back to the weak and beggarly elements, to which they wished again to be in bondage, [verse 9,] would be returning to a life of sin. Neither does verse 10 refer to the Levitical law, but to the former customs of the Galatians, who were Gentiles or heathen; and therefore they could not have lived in the observance of the law given to Israel through Moses. This conclusion is not only reasonable, but unavoidable, when we consider that the observance of times was a heathen custom, strictly prohibited by the Lord at the same time that the law of Moses was enjoined. Thus after the ceremonies of the law are described in Leviticus, it is said, [Chap. xix, 26,] "Neither shall ye use enchantments, nor observe times." That the connection to which the observance of times belongs may be clearly seen, we copy Deut. xviii, 9-12: "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee." In 2 Chron. xxxiii, 2, 5, 6, it is said of king Manasseh, that he did "that which was evil in the sight of the Lord like unto the abominations of the heathen." "And he built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. And he caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom; also he observed times, and used enchantments, and dealt with a familiar spirit, and with wizards." As we cannot believe that the Lord both prohibited and enjoined the same thing at the same time, we are led to the conclusion that the times of Gal. iv, 10, have no reference to the Law of Moses. And we can see no

more necessity for referring the "days" mentioned in the text to the feast days and times of convocation in the law, than the "times." We find both these terms in common use, yet they are not used in the sense which is commonly attached to them in the scripture in question. Many, even in the present age, observe both times and days according to the customs of the heathen, who would be startled at the thought of observing the rites of the Mosaic law; they will neither plant nor sow except at particular times, nor begin any work but on particular days. With them Friday is made an unlucky day, and Sunday a sacred day, both ideas being derived from the same source, viz., heathen superstition; but who dare argue from thence that it is wrong to observe the seventh day or Sabbath, which God has blessed and sanctified as a holy day?

Some may object that this declaration conflicts with the fact that the first-day Sabbath was instituted by the Papal power; but there is a difference between dedicating a day to the sun and giving it the place and title of the Sabbath or Lord's day. That the heathen were the first to consider the first day as a day of worship or sacred day, the Catholics themselves allow; while they plainly declare that "the church" "changed the Sabbath into Sunday!" The following testimonies on these points are from the *Douay Catechism*.

Ques. What is Sunday, or the Lord's Day in general?

Ans. It is a day dedicated by the Apostles to the honor of the most holy Trinity, and in memory that Christ our Lord arose from the dead upon Sunday, sent down the holy Ghost on a Sunday, &c.; and therefore it is called the Lord's Day. It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination of *Dies Solis*, the day of the sun, to which it was sacred.—Page 143.

Q. Why was the Jewish Sabbath changed into the Sunday?

A. Because Christ was born upon a Sunday, rose from the dead upon a Sunday, and sent down the Holy Ghost upon a Sunday: works not inferior to the creation of the world.

Q. By whom was it changed?

A. By the Governors of the Church, the Apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day, (which was Sunday,) Apoc. i, 10.

Q. How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?

A. By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves, by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.—Page 58.

All will admit that the Galatians had been affected with Judaizing notions of self-righteousness; yet we trust it has been made plain that other errors were obtaining among them, having no reference to the customs of the Jews. If they "turned back" to their former practices they would again become heathen idolaters; but if under the influence of other teachers they resorted to circumcision, and looked to the law for justification, they were also under condemnation, being proved sinners by their own rule of justification, and this is the signification of the phrase, "under the law," as used in the letters to the Romans and Galatians. Then when it is asked, (Gal. iv, 21,) "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" an explanation is given in Rom. iii, 19, where it is expressly declared that "the law speaks to them who are under the law;" therefore they are they who hear the law; and the effect produced is that every mouth is stopped, and all become guilty before God. This, we think, plainly shows that the Apostle was convincing them of sin by the moral law; yet it has been supposed to convey a different sense from its connection with the quotation in verse 22:—"For it is written that Abraham had two sons: the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman." The scripture quoted is not written in the law, but in Genesis, in a record of events which transpired some four hundred years before the law was given at Sinai. There are those who contend that the quotation above was written in the law, and was what the Galatians were cited to hear; but again the same class of objectors will tell us that the whole system of law, moral, civil, and ecclesiastical, was unknown till after the exodus from Egypt. How they will reconcile the two declarations, we are at a loss to determine; for if this scripture is any part of what was termed the law, then the pre-existence of the law

is evident. But as this would prove altogether too much to suit our opponents, we will consider it admitted that the quotation in question is not taken from the law, but the two sons of Abraham are introduced as an allegory or figure of the two covenants. It is often taken for granted that this signifies the two laws; but such a position is not warranted by any scripture, as we propose to show. First, I am willing to rest upon the evidence produced that there has been but one moral law, and there never will nor can be another. And, the phrase "two laws" may be properly used to embrace the moral law of God—the ten commandments—and the ceremonial law, or law of Moses. The first, or moral law, called also God's holy covenant, was not one of the covenants alluded to by the Apostle; but it was the condition of both covenants; and the second, or Levitical law, was not one of these covenants, but was appended to or connected with the Sinaitic covenant. Thus in Heb. ix, 1, where this covenant is mentioned, Paul says it had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary; but the covenant itself was complete before it had these ordinances, or ceremonies, and before the sanctuary was made.

Having already shown the difference between the two laws, it will be necessary in the further consideration of this chapter to contrast the two covenants. The Abrahamic covenant, (Jerusalem above,) of which we are made children and heirs by faith in Christ, has been so fully noticed that it will be unnecessary to go into an extended examination of that: a recapitulation of the points brought to view being sufficient. We have seen that its basis was the moral law; and its promises, the blessings of the gospel. All the purposes of God toward man since his fall have been manifested with direct reference to man's condition as a sinner; so this covenant appears as the development of a great plan of salvation; and as man has violated the condition on which the covenant was based, he has forfeited the blessings, so that future personal obedience is no longer sufficient to obtain them; but the obedience of faith is required. Faith must have some object on which to rest; Christ is set forth as a propitiation for our transgressions; and therefore the Mediator of the covenant. Then we have the covenant in full thus: the law for its basis, the gospel blessings for its promises, Jesus Christ its Mediator, and the heavenly Sanctuary his place of ministration, where he is embraced and the blessing secured through the obedience of faith.

The Sinaitic covenant we now proceed to notice. This may be found in Ex. xix, 5-8. The Lord sent a message to the children of Israel by Moses, as follows: "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people; for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." The people sent back an answer, saying, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." But as yet they had not heard his voice, neither had he declared his covenant unto them: only they had seen what he did for them, how he bare them on eagles' wings and brought them unto himself. Verse 4. But the agreement was entered into, the arrangement made, and every thing in readiness for a declaration of God's holy covenant, the condition of the covenant made, or agreement entered into, with them. All should bear in mind the fact that the term covenant is used in reference to different things in the Bible: as a promise; [Gen. ix, 8-17,] agreement, [Ex. xix, 5-8; Heb. viii, 9,] or law; [1 Chron. xvi, 15-17; Deut. iv, 12, 13,] so that as in the chapter in consideration, a covenant or law may be given as the condition of a covenant or agreement made; and the signification of the word is sufficiently comprehensive to warrant such a use of it in the sacred writings: being, according to Greenfield, "Any disposition, arrangement, institution, or dispensation; hence a testament, will, or covenant." When they made the promise they had not yet heard his voice; but on the third day thereafter the Lord appeared on Mt. Sinai and gave with his own voice the ten commandments;

[Continued on Page 190.]

THE REVIEW AND HERALD.

"Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth."

ROCHESTER THIRD-DAY, JULY 18, 1854.

LEARNED FOLLY.

EVERY popular church has its Doctors of Divinity. This is an order of men that Christ never instituted. "But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren." Matt. xxiii, 8. The divinity of the Scriptures has never been sick, and has never needed doctors; but human divinity, from the church of Rome down to the younger sects, has found the services of this class of men indispensable. If the efforts of these doctors were directed to the bringing of human divinity to the standard of the Scriptures, they would in this be worthy of all praise. But with some honorable exceptions, the reverse of this is true. The labor of their whole lives seems to be spent in making scriptural divinity conform to that of their several religious bodies. Hence some of the plainest truths in the Word of God are reduced to nothing, and things not mentioned by God in his word, are made to become truths of the first importance.

As an illustration of the manner in which the word of God is made to correspond with the doctrines of men, we will refer to the fourth commandment. The Pagans' "venerable day of the sun" has by the great apostasy been put in the place of the Sabbath of the commandment. When the Protestants separated from the church of Rome, they brought away this venerable Sunday with them. As they had appealed from the Pope to the Bible, it could not have been very difficult for them to discover what Romanists freely admit; namely, that "the Scripture doth nowhere mention this change of the Sabbath." With this discovery, it would seem the most natural thing in the world that they should at once return to the fourth commandment, and obey God in this, as in all his other commandments. But they have not done it, though three hundred years have elapsed since the Reformation. On the contrary, their Doctors of Divinity have placed the fourth commandment in their alembic, and by some scientific process have reduced it to nothing. All the while, however, they profess the highest regard for its authority. The following is the most approved method of dissolving the commandment into thin air:—

1. The fourth commandment during the former dispensation, required men to observe "one seventh part of time as the Sabbath, but not the definite seventh day."

2. The Sabbath has been "changed to another day of the week."

3. In the gospel dispensation, the fourth commandment requires us to keep "one day in seven, but no definite day."

To state this in a word:—The Sabbath has been changed from "one day in seven, and no day in particular," to another "day in seven, and no day in particular;" and that other "day in seven and no day in particular," is the first day of the week! which the Protestant church is zealously attempting to compel all men to observe. The labors of a whole school of Doctors of Divinity are needed, to keep the first-day Sabbath in repair, and the above is, in reality, their best way, as yet, of making the fourth commandment support the first day of the week.

That other "day in seven, and no day in particular," must certainly be the notable, "eighth day," brought to view by the fabulous epistle of Barnabas. Those who choose to keep the "eighth day," can act as they see fit, but they will find it impossible to keep three "eight days" in succession, and have them all come on Sundays. Sunday-keeping is the Romanists' just reproach upon Protestants; and Protestants will not be able to wipe this reproach away, until they turn from the traditions of men, to keep all the commandments of God.

J. N. A.

Note from Bro. Waggoner.

I wish to say a few words to the scattered flock relative to the articles that I commenced publishing some time since on the Law of God, and especially to my friends who have so often inquired why I have not concluded them. The reasons are, I have been severely afflicted with weakness of my eyes, so that I could not write; much of the time for some months past I have been unable to write enough to answer letters received from my friends. This, and the occupation of much of my time in other matters, has made it impossible for me to devote much time to study.

Perhaps I ought also to state that I have not been forward to finish these articles as they involved the consideration of certain texts of scripture which I did not understand as they have been presented by the brethren who have written before me; and to prevent confusion, it becomes us to be careful and only move where duty is clear. The promise is, that the Watchmen shall see eye to eye; and we are exhorted to be of one mind and speak the same thing. The unity of the faith must be sought, but to attain to the unity of the faith we must have the truth. Let us search for it as for hidden treasures!

In regard to these texts I will say, that the sentiments I have advanced are according to my views of the teachings of the Word without respect to what may have been previously written; and my desire is ever to move forward with the increase of light, and the development of truth.

The articles are now finished and forwarded for publication; and I pray that God may bless this feeble effort to the advancement of the holy cause of truth; and to the good of the remnant who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.

J. H. WAGGONER.

Waukau, Wis., July 5, 1854.

WE would call especial attention to Bro. Waggoner's articles on the Law of God. They should be read with much care, and the truth they express should be well studied.

We have just published, in pamphlet form, 6000 copies of Bro. W.'s entire work on the Law—132 pages; which we recommend to our readers as a most valuable and important work. Brethren, let this Pamphlet be briskly circulated, while it may do a good and great work on the hearts of honest inquirers for truth—Price \$7.00 per 100, 10 cents single copy.

Perpetuity of the Law of God.

J. WESLEY says:—"It was not the design of Christ's coming, to revoke any part of the law of God. There is therefore the closest connection that can be conceived, between the law and the gospel."

Scott says:—"The moral law he came to fulfill by perfectly obeying it as the surety of his people in his life, suffering death and doctrine; to establish it in its fullest honor and authority, and to make the most effectual provision for men's loving and obeying it."

A. Barnes says:—"Matt. v, 18. 'Till heaven and earth pass.' This expression denotes that the law never should be destroyed, till it should be all fulfilled. It is the same as saying; Everything may change, the very earth and heaven may pass away; but the law of God shall not be destroyed till its whole design shall be accomplished." In conclusion on verse 19th, he says:—"We learn hence, 1. That all the law of God is binding on Christians. 2. That all the commands of God should be preached in their proper place, by Christian ministers. 3. That they who pretend that there are any laws of God so small that they need not obey them, are unworthy of his kingdom. And 4. That true piety has respect to all the commandments of God, and keeps them."

Michigan Tent.

BRO. M. E. CORNELL writes from Shelby, July 13th: "We now wish we had a 90-foot Tent. It is thought there will be 1500 or 2000 people here next First-day. The Tent remains in that place over three Sabbaths and First-days. We trust that the Brethren who are la-

boring with the Tent will be prospered in the great work of presenting the reasons of our faith and hope. They should have the sympathy of all the friends of the cause. Let all do something to aid them in their work. It is too often the case that some excuse themselves from aiding the servants of God in their self-sacrificing labors for the salvation of perishing souls, because they think they are poor; yet these very persons are able to leave their business and attend meeting after meeting. This is wrong. Rather, let them be, "Not slothful in business, [but,] fervent in spirit, serving the Lord," at home, that they may have something to help the cause, and not burden the brethren at the place of meeting. We hope the brethren in Michigan will stay up the hands of the friends of truth and Church Order, and not be affected by a few disorderly spirits who have gone out from us, and are our bitterest enemies. It may be our duty to "mark," or note, some such who seek to cause division, that the flock may shun them.

THE SABBATH.

TEACHINGS OF THE SAVIOUR.

BUT if Jesus Christ did not break the Sabbath, and did not say or do any thing which showed that it would be abolished, or the obligation to keep it holy be relaxed, why were the Pharisees so constantly at variance with him on this subject; and why did they so often accuse him of breaking the Sabbath? Because they hated him, and because he violated their traditions about the Sabbath. The fact was, they had added to the Sabbath law, as they had to other laws, numerous traditions of their own, and they regarded these more than they did the law itself. Thus they often made void the law through their traditions. These traditions Jesus disregarded, and showed by words and deeds that they were vain. He thus demonstrated that they were false teachers: blind leaders of the blind. This greatly enraged them, and led them to watch occasions of accusation against him.

For instance: they said, that if a son should say of that portion of property with which he ought to assist his parents, "It is corban," that is, a gift devoted to the Lord, he was released from his obligation to assist them, though God had commanded him to do it. Thus they made void the law of God through their traditions. So it was with the fourth commandment. They had added to it numerous and cumbrous errors, which tended to lead the mind to a blind and superstitious regard for them, and to overlook and disregard the spiritual meaning and real object of the Sabbath.

They enumerated about forty primary works, which they said were forbidden to be done on the Sabbath. Under each of these were numerous secondary works, which they said were also forbidden. These were so explained as to include works of mercy performed by Jesus, and thus to make him a Sabbath-breaker. Hence, they said he could not be the Messiah, for he did not, in the sense of their traditions, keep the Sabbath.

Among the primary works which were forbidden, were ploughing, sowing, reaping, winnowing, cleaning, grinding, etc. Under the head of grinding was included the breaking or dividing of things which were before united. Of course, when the disciples broke off the heads of grain, and rubbed out the kernels in their hands, and ate them, it was a dividing of things which were before united, a species of grinding, which was, in their view, forbidden, and unlawful on the Sabbath-day.

Another of their traditions, was, that, as threshing on the Sabbath was forbidden, the bruising of things, which was a species of threshing, was also forbidden. Of course, it was a violation of the Sabbath to walk on green grass, for that would bruise or thresh it. So, as a man might not hurt on the Sabbath, he might not catch a flea, for that was a species of hunting. As a man might not carry a burden on the Sabbath, he might not carry water to a thirsty animal, for that was a species of burden; but he might pour water into a trough and lead the animal to it. It was on this ground that they objected to a man's carrying his couch

from the pool of Bethesda. Yet should a sheep fall into a pit, they would readily lift him out, and bear him to a place of safety. They would also loose an ox or an ass on the Sabbath, and lead him away to watering. Yet they objected to our Saviour's loosing a woman from her infirmity, though she had been bound by it eighteen years, and he could loose her by a word. Thus they "strained at a gnat, and swallowed a camel."

They said a man might minister to the sick for the purpose of relieving their distress, but not for the purpose of healing their diseases. He might put a covering on a diseased eye, or anoint it with eye-salve for the purpose of easing the pain, but not to cure the eye. Hence the eagerness with which they watched the Saviour, to see whether he would heal on the Sabbath, that, if he should, they might accuse him. And when he did heal, and did it on purpose to show the futility of their objections, as well as his power to remove diseases, they were filled with wrath, and sought to kill him, though he showed from the Scriptures, and from their own admissions, that he had done nothing wrong. He stripped the Sabbath of the false appendages which they had attached to it, vindicated its divine authority and permanent obligation, pointed out its true objects and the proper manner of observing it, that his disciples, guided by his teaching and example, might in all ages remember it and keep it holy.

They would not on the Sabbath even take down the bodies of those who were crucified. Hence, they besought Pilate that the death of Jesus, and of those who were crucified with him, might be hastened by the breaking of their legs, so that their bodies might be taken down before the Sabbath began.

But, with all this scrupulosity, they could with wicked hands, crucify him, and impiously say, "His blood be on us, and on our children." With good reason, therefore, did he say, "Ye hypocrites, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Without repentance of their sins and faith in him as their Redeemer, they could not escape.

"But if the Sabbath was to be remembered and kept holy, according to the requirements of the moral law, why did Jesus not say more about the keeping of it? Why did he not exhort them to rest from their labors?" Because it was not needful. As to external rest, they already kept it, and with superstitious exactness. Those who would not on that day heal the sick, walk on green grass, take water to a thirsty animal, carry a couch or catch a flea, did not need to be exhorted to abstain from worldly business. They knew that to be a duty, and of permanent obligation. What they needed was, to have the keeping of it stripped of the false glosses and superstitious observances with which they had encumbered it; to have the true object of the day, and the spirit with which it should be kept, pointed out. This was what he did, by word and deed, even at the hazard of his life.

Did they contend that hunger should go unappeased rather than that a man should pluck heads of grain, rub out the kernels, and eat them? He suffered his disciples to do this, and from the Bible vindicated their course.

Did they contend that the sick should not be healed, even by him who could do it with a word? He repeatedly did it: saying to the woman who had been eighteen years ill, "Thou art loosed from thine infirmity;" to the paralytic, "Stretch forth thine hand;" and to the man at the pool of Bethesda after thirty-eight years of confinement, "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk." They immediately did so—a most conclusive testimony from God that the silly traditions of the Pharisees were in opposition to his will. The blind received their sight, the lame walked, lepers were cleansed, the deaf heard, the dead were raised, and the poor had the Gospel preached to them; thus demonstrating that he was the Messiah, that the Pharisees, in opposing him, were of their father the Devil, and that the lusts of their father they would do.

At all points he rebuked their superstitions, stripped off false glosses, and trampled down their traditions. But he never broke the fourth commandment,

or violated any of the moral laws. He never said or did any thing which countenanced the idea that there was not to be a weekly Sabbath under the Gospel, or that it was not to be kept in as holy a manner as under the law. But all that he said and did was adapted to show that "the Sabbath was made for man:" not for the Jews only, or for any particular part of the human race, in one age or country, but for the whole human family. * * *

But does not Paul say or imply, 2 Cor. iii, 2, etc., that the moral law is done away under the Gospel; and thus the obligation to keep the Sabbath has ceased? No: he says and implies no such thing. All that he says, here or elsewhere, instead of making void the moral law, goes to establish it; not as a ground of justification, but as a rule of duty; not as a part of the Jewish dispensation, for that was abolished at the death of Christ, but as a part of the moral government of God, which is binding under all dispensations. The obligation to obey this law, instead of being diminished, is increased by the Gospel. One of the peculiar glories of the Gospel, and that which renders it so far superior to the Jewish dispensation is, that under the Gospel the Holy Spirit much more extensively writes this law upon the hearts of men, inclining them to obey it, not outwardly or in the letter merely, but in spirit and in truth.

It is not in having the letter of the law on tables of stone, or in their hands, that will save men, but it is having the law written upon their hearts by the Holy Spirit, as is done to a much greater extent under the Gospel than it was under the law. It is this that constitutes the superior glory of the Gospel. And it is this superior glory of the Gospel, as the dispensation peculiarly of the Spirit, that Paul sets forth in the third chapter of the second Epistle to the Corinthians. The Jews were prone to place a high value upon the former dispensation, and to glory in it, while they set themselves in opposition to Christ, saying, "We know that God spake to Moses; but as for this fellow, we know not whence he is." "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath-day." "Give God the praise, for we know that this man is a sinner."

There was, at the giving of the law, and the introduction of the Jewish dispensation, great visible glory, and much that was calculated to impress the senses. It caused the face of Moses so to shine that the people could not steadfastly behold it. But there was under the Gospel much greater glory; not material, impressing the outward senses, but spiritual, affecting the feelings and dispositions of the heart. The one was as much superior to the other, as its effects would be more durable and glorious. Under the one, the moral precepts were written on tables of stone, and their observance was inculcated by outward forms and ceremonies, numerous and burdensome, called in the New Testament, "carnal ordinances." The other taught them with greater clearness and fullness, and proclaimed them with greater effect; writing them on the fleshly tables of the heart, in fulfillment of the promise: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God and they shall be my people." But this, instead of doing away the law, established it, and gave it practical power over the hearts and lives of men. As this was done to a greater extent under the Gospel, it was on that account, in view of the Apostle a more glorious dispensation:—*Sab. Manual.*

[From the New York Evangelist.

THAT GLANCE!

"And the Lord turned and looked upon Peter." That disciple but recently met the fierce and searching gaze of the Roman soldiers. The keen eye of the malignant Jew had disturbed him. He was troubled also by the penetrating look of the maid who said, "Thou also wast with Jesus of Galilee." But there was one present who had forborne, it seems, till now, to notice the fallen disciple. But when he did, one glance was enough. When Peter's eye met that of his Lord, what emotions were awakened!

It was the look of a friend. And such a friend! Whose kind and sweet voice was it that summoned

him from his nets to be a fisher of men? What mortal had ever been more favored, as for three years he had dwelt under the radiance of the Light of the world?

Who gave him a vision of the heavenly glory on the Mount of Transfiguration; admitting him into the secret places of the Most High, and under the shadow of the Almighty? Who was he that pitied him in his moral darkness and guilt, had assuaged his domestic sorrow, had honored him with a chief place among the founders of his glorious kingdom, and was now about to die for him, that earthly good might be crowned with everlasting life? There stood such a benefactor bound, buffeted, despised, denied, and his ears now ringing with the language of that denial, and the awful profanity that gave what was already crimson a more deadly hue. There stood he, an injured friend—how kind a friend, how deeply injured!

That glance! Peter understood it. Words were not necessary. Mingled with a rebuke, it was a look of kindness still. A glance from such a being, at such an hour, and on such a man. Could Peter withstand it? Could he brave that glance, and in spite of it, carry out in hardness of heart, the denial that oath had just confirmed? No! the unhappy man cannot endure it. That gaze of the injured friend caused all that friend's kindness to rush upon his mind, while the consciousness of his own ill-treatment of him overwhelmed him with the deepest remorse and misery.

"And he went out." How could he remain in the presence of one so deeply injured? The glance of that eye had kindled a flame in his soul. He must retire. He must seek a place to weep. The deep fountains of his heart are broken up. His fear of man had bewildered his mind—drew a rash denial from his lips and cursing with it. But that glance has reclaimed him. He is a man, a disciple again. He was fallen; how deeply fallen! But that anguish, and those tears—they speak for him. He is not a lost man. He was overpowered by the sudden shock of temptation. A powerful onset of Satan bore him away; but those tears dashed Satan's hopes. The broken heart is the fallen man's recovery. Shout, enemy of all righteousness, as you sift him as wheat, and malignantly triumph over his fall! You'll have other work soon. The prostrate disciple rises, and standing now on firmer ground than ever, your dark empire will find in him an assailant that shall shake many of its walls, and burn many of its gates with fire.

Reader, the Lord looketh upon you. His eye is not the flaming fire of a righteous judge. 'Tis that of mercy and good will. But is there nothing of rebuke in it? As it called before Peter his own character, is there nothing in yours for it to fix your eyes upon? Have you no occasion for tears?

That glance! Beware of what it shall be when the Redeemer shall come in the clouds of heaven, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.

HOW TO RETAIN THE TRUE IDEA AND PRACTICE OF TRUE RELIGION.—1. Inquire after the fundamental reasons of your conduct. Reader, do nothing, and commit yourself to no course of action, without raising the inquiry, what is the great fundamental reason by which you are actuated; and suffer not yourself to go forward without the testimony of your own conscientiousness, that you are disinterestedly benevolent in what you do.

2. Keep Christ's life and temper before you as the great exemplar, the great and powerful instrument of making you benevolent as he was. Faith in the truths of the gospel, unwavering confidence that those things recorded of Christ are true, gives the life and example of Christ the greatest power over you to make you benevolent like himself.

3. Pray much in the Holy Ghost, and remember that unless you pray in the Spirit, you are sure to let slip the true idea and practice of true religion.

4. In order to pray in the Holy Ghost, you must watch unto prayer. Unless you watch you will be sure to grieve the Spirit of God away.

5. Be sure that you neglect no duty. Remember that neglect is just as absolutely a violation of the law of God, as any positive crime is.

6. Maintain a consciousness that you do everything for the glory of God. This is perfectly practicable. A worldly man is conscious of the great end he has in view in all his ways. He knows why he labors and toils, why he refuses to make this expenditure, and why he makes that speculation.—*Oberlin Evangelist.*

[Continued from Page 187.]

[Ex. xx, 22; Deut. iv, 12, 13, 36; v, 22-26:] therefore to obey his voice was to keep the ten commandments. Keeping his covenant was also keeping the ten commandments, as the following scriptures will show: 1 Chron. xvi, 15-18; Deut. iv, 12, 13; ix, 9-11; Ex. xxxi, 18; xxxiv, 28. These commandments are all that were comprehended in the expressions, "Obey my voice," and "Keep my covenant," as we have seen that these constituted the covenant which he spake with his voice, and wrote on two tables of stone; and it is said in Deut. v, 22, "He added no more." See also Jer. vii, 22, 23.

We have now before us the covenant with its conditions; and we next come to inquire into the nature of the promises of that covenant. It is generally supposed that these referred only to temporal benefits, and that these benefits were conferred according to promise. Against this view we have several objections to offer. As these blessings were conditional, if they were conferred according to agreement, it follows that they with whom the covenant was made either fulfilled the conditions, or had their transgressions atoned for by the mediators of that covenant. But the scriptures abundantly prove that they did not obey his voice, nor keep his covenant, [Num. xxxii, 14; Deut. ix, 6; xxxi, 27; xxxii, 20; Jer. xlv, 9, 10,] so that in their own persons they were not entitled to the promised blessings; neither did the priests who served under that covenant make an atonement for their sins; as the condition of the covenant was a rule of moral obligation, for the violation of which the blood of calves and goats could not atone. Heb. x 1-4. We admit that they atoned for these transgressions in a figure, looking to Christ for the realization of the fact; and Christ is the only priest who has ever offered blood, having power to cleanse from the transgression of that law; and for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, (covenant,) that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix, 15. But this cuts off the idea that a temporal inheritance was contemplated in the promise, as the mediators of the first covenant did not take away sin, or secure the promises; and the mediation under the new covenant is for a different purpose: to wit, an eternal inheritance.

That this covenant did not embrace mere temporal benefits, is further seen by an examination of the nature of its promises and condition. The Lord promised that if they would keep his covenant they should be unto him a peculiar treasure, a holy nation. Now all the nations of the earth were sinners, and wicked in the sight of God, so that they would truly have been a peculiar people if they had kept the law of God: and they would have been a holy nation. This fact needs a careful consideration. We have seen that God's law is his own prescribed rule of holiness, and that this rule is eternal and unchangeable in its nature; that the requirement of holiness as the ground of acceptance with him is the same in all dispensations; therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the reward is ever the same. Prov. xi, 19; Isa. xxxii, 17; Rom. vi, 22. God's ways are equal. Life and death were suspended on their obedience or disobedience to his law. Deut. xxx, 15, 16. But it is insisted that they could not keep the law, and therefore if eternal interests were suspended on their obedience, God was merely tantalizing them by placing before them blessings which they could not reach, and requirements which they could not fulfill.

We have thus far argued from the nature of this law, and the consequence of complete, perfect obedience on the part of Adam and all his posterity, while we have not expressed or intimated a belief that any one unaided by the mediator of the new covenant, could perfectly keep it since the fall of Adam, and the consequent corruption of the human race through him, their representative head. On the contrary, we believe that the Scriptures plainly teach that we cannot, independent of Christ,

keep that law in its letter and spirit. If it were ever possible, since Adam's fall, for man to keep the law, no doubt that possibility still exists; and if so, inasmuch as the doers of the law would be justified, and life is the reward of obedience, (for the wages of sin is death,) then there would exist two complete methods of salvation at the same time—personal obedience, and faith in Christ. But this is not in accordance with the scripture which declares that when we were *without strength* Christ died for us; [Rom. v, 6;] and the Saviour says, without me ye can do nothing; [John xv, 5;] and again it is said, By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; but the just shall live by faith. Rom. iii, 20; Gal. iii, 11. Much might be quoted to the same effect, but it will be sufficient to direct the mind to those scriptures which show the impossibility of escaping the wrath of God, if we neglect the salvation offered through Jesus Christ.

But while we admit the fact that they could not keep the law, we deny the conclusion that has been drawn from it, viz., that it was inconsistent for God to place a condition before them which they could not fulfill. When we understand the purpose for which the law was proclaimed as the condition of the Sinaitic covenant, we shall see that that purpose was accomplished; but it would not have been accomplished if it had been in their power to keep it. We turn again to the Apostle's argument in Galatians iii. He first shows the necessity of faith, and that the blessing of Abraham is bestowed on the faithful; that the law on which the Abrahamic covenant was founded being violated, all are under the curse; and Christ the Mediator of that covenant redeems us from the curse, that we may inherit the promise. At Sinai the law was confirmed to Israel as the condition of another covenant, to continue for a limited time, and the object of its being so given was that it might serve as a school-master to bring them to Christ. Now it must be apparent to all that if they fulfilled the conditions of that covenant, or kept the law, it would fail to bring them to Christ, and if it were even possible for them to keep it, it would lead them to trust in themselves, and seek for justification by personal obedience, instead of seeking to the Saviour for it. The same fact is shown in Gal. iv, 24, where it is said that this covenant brings forth children to bondage, wherefore, it is fitly represented by Hagar, the bond-woman, the mother of Ishmael.

The two covenants are contrasted in Heb. viii, and ix. Some have supposed that the covenant mentioned in Heb. viii, 10-12, remains to be made in the future, in the administration of Messiah, when it is supposed he will be both King and Priest on the throne of his father David. As a correct understanding of this subject seems to be necessary to an understanding of Gal. iv, and as our present relation to the law is affected by the relation we sustain to this covenant, we will offer a few reasons why we cannot believe it to be in the future:—

1. Zechariah vi, 12, 13, refers to the present and not to any future dispensation. As this prophecy has been much relied on to prove the opposite, we will examine it. "Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the Lord; even he shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his [the Lord's] throne; and he shall be a Priest upon his [the Lord's] throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." In Rev. iii, 21, Jesus declares that he is now set down in his Father's throne, and is in expectation of his own throne. See Acts ii, 29-35. Paul says, [Heb. viii, 1,] "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the Sanctuary," &c. In the prophecy above quoted he is represented as sitting a Priest on the throne of the Lord, "and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." This is fulfilled in the present position of Christ on the throne of God, a mediator between God and man. But he is to leave the throne of the Father, and cease to minister in the Sanctuary before he comes to earth. Therefore,

2. There can be no remission of sins according to the promise of the new covenant, after the coming of Christ. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission, and the blood of Christ is the only remedy to heal the breach made in God's holy law. This blood he offers in the Sanctuary and true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man; and as there is but one offering, and this but once offered, [Heb. ix, 25, 26; x, 14,] so there is but one Priest who can approach the throne of God to make an atonement. 1 Tim. ii, 5.

3. A revival of the types of Christ's ministration is impossible. This we consider evidently true from the nature and object of such institutions: being shadows of things to come, or examples and illustrations of the work of Christ. No sin was remitted by the means of such blood as was offered in the worldly sanctuary, as it only pointed to a future fact: that fact being reached by faith, and realized when all the righteous with Daniel *stand in their lot* in the person of their Advocate. But such an order of things cannot exist after the priesthood of Christ closes. As the fact cannot go before the figure or type, or the thing signified before the sign thereof, it would seem to be absurd to make an atonement in figure for a sin which had already been atoned for in fact; and as repentance and confession must precede remission, [Mark i, 4; Acts ii, 38; 1 John i, 9,] it would seem still more absurd to make a typical atonement after the sin was committed, when it had been done in fact, and remission granted, before it was committed!

4. The Apostle represented himself and fellow-laborers as ministers of the new covenant. We presume none will contend that the saints can be priests independently: they must act in a subordinate sense. Jesus Christ himself is the High Priest, and minister of this covenant according to Heb. viii, 1-6; and Paul says in 2 Cor. v, 18-20, that God "hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you for us; we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God." It is written in 1 Pet. ii, 5, "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." (Whiting, Macknight.) And again Paul says in 2 Cor. iii, 3, 5, 6, "Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us;" (prepared by our service—Whiting;) "Our sufficiency is of God who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament."

These and other texts of a similar import clearly prove that the present dispensation is under the ministration of the new covenant. It will be recollected that Paul says, *We have such an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister &c.*; [Heb. viii, 1, 2;] and in verse 6, "*Now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant which was established upon better promises.*" And as the first testament was dedicated or ratified with blood, because a testament is of force only after the death of the testator; so Christ once offered himself to God, and is thus become the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Heb. ix, 14-18. But it may here be urged that if the promises of the Sinaitic covenant embraced the blessings to be conferred by Christ on the faithful, then the promises of the new covenant could not with propriety be called better; but the difference does not consist in the blessings contemplated, but in the manner in which they were to be attained. The promises of Ex. xix, 5-8, rest solely on the obedience of those to whom they were made, without any provision for the benefit of the transgressor; and the ministration of the priests under that covenant did not release the transgressor from the curse attached to disobedience; because it was not possible

for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin; but this was all the blood they had to offer, so that if promises of forgiveness had been incorporated in that covenant, such promises could not have been realized from the ministration under it, and therefore no such promises were then made. But the blood of Christ cleanses from sin, so that the covenant of which he is the mediator contains the promise: "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." In this respect alone was the first covenant faulty. Had its conditions been perfectly obeyed, no fault could have been found with it; true, it was insufficient to give life to the transgressor, but if it had not been broken, they could certainly have enjoyed the favor of God: or if it had embraced forgiveness of sins, and thereby have given life, no necessity would have existed for another covenant. See Gal. iii, 21. In Heb. viii, where the necessity of the new covenant is shown, it says, verse 8, "For finding fault with them he saith, behold the days come," &c.; and the reason is thus given in verse 9: "Because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord." He promised to regard them as a peculiar treasure, if they would obey his voice; but inasmuch as they did not obey his voice, the agreement was broken on their part, and the Lord was not bound by his promise to regard them as a peculiar treasure. Neither was it possible for him to regard them as a peculiar people, or holy nation, because that was not their true character. They were transgressors of his law, and of course sinners, unholy, like the other nations.

(Concluded next week.)

Who are, and who are not, Subjects for the Kingdom of God?

Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? and then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity. The great Teacher, while he dwelt among men, was careful to bring to view all the devices of the wicked heart: the self-righteous, the hypocrite, the adulterer, the liar, the blasphemer or any commandment breaker, could not be hid from the close inspection of Him whose knowledge extends to the thoughts, and motives of the human heart. And while dependent man can read from the Bible, that all his acts of transgression are known to God, he yet dares to rebel and continue to sin. Our blessed Lord in this text, "lays the axe at the root of the tree," to cut off all unscriptural hope of entering into his kingdom, and also brings to view the characters, that shall, and shall not, enter into his kingdom. Possibly the thought, in some heart may arise, viz., How can we know when we are doing the will of our Father in heaven? Let Christ first answer: "If ye love me keep my commandments." Can any one love Christ and not love the Father? "He that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father." "He that hath my commandments and doeth them, he it is that loveth me." "Blessed are they that do his (the Father's) commandments," &c. "I and my Father are one." "And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." Thanks and high praises, be ascribed to God forever, that they who do his will, shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or of man." What doctrine? We answer, The doctrine of truth—"thy word is truth." Does the Bible any where teach us, that any who do not have respect to all the commandments of God shall enter into life? Nay, verily. Let Christ's words decide, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Then the keeping of the commandments of God is the Bible requirement of the Great Law-giver. Those who live by every word of God, i. e., do all of the requirements of God, are doubtless doing the will of their heavenly Father; consequently such are fit subjects for his kingdom, while those who rebel and disregard the life-sealing laws of the great Law-giver, are denominated, subjects for Damnation!! But Christ foresaw that in the great day of separation, there would be many (not a few) that would say to him, Lord, Lord, &c. Will the greatest portion of the "many" hail from North America? this enlightened land of Slavery! My thoughts fly back to 1843-4, to that loving, consecrated company, who were loving each other fervently, and all absorbed in the speedy coming of

"this same Jesus," but O the sad change, relative to many, since that memorable period when the 2300 days ended. O will any from among the loving alluded to, be found fulfilling our Lord's predictions, Lord, Lord, &c.; and if so will not the mournful detail be added:—Why Lord thou knowest thy Spirit was poured out upon us in 1843-4, and we were expecting thy coming; and we went forward, laboring for the good of souls, and with all our hearts we were enabled to proclaim, Behold the Bridegroom Cometh, &c.; and further Lord, we heartily engaged in the first and second angels' messages, and many souls were converted through our instrumentality; and now Lord, since we have endeavored to be faithful in thy cause, why cannot we enter the kingdom?

In our imagination do we hear the judge reply, I know that some of you labored faithfully for me according to the light you had; but you had no Bible authority to believe that the Son of man would appear in 1844. The foundation of your disappointment, was in the view that the earth was called the Sanctuary, while the Sanctuary that was to be cleansed was in heaven; and the Son of man, the antitypical High Priest was making the atonement for man, and cleansing the Sanctuary. You are not condemned for the error you then embraced; but since that point of time passed, that you are guilty of disregarding one or more of my Father's commands. You were not condemned before light shone forth in due time, especially on the fourth commandment; but you have not only broken my laws and commands yourself; but you have taught others to do the same, by shedding your unholy influence upon them and some of you have scattered your deleterious influence from the Press and been persecuting my people who love my law and commandments; and my reproof to you, through them, you have rejected. How often have you read my word by my servant James, that if you "offend in one point, you are guilty of all." Your former good deeds, and righteousness by faith in me, is of no avail to you now; you have sinned against light which I have sent through my servants and Word. Depart from me ye that work iniquity. O my Lord, save thy people, the "little flock;" and if possible cause the blinded transgressors of thy holy law and commandments, to see their fearful doom, in time to escape the snare.

The newspapers of the day seem to be involved in mystery, relative to the slow progress of the eastern wars; but the Governor and Upholder of all things is at the helm. Hold, hold, a little longer upon the four winds, ye angels of my charge! may have been uttered.

O my brethren, who are entrusted with the momentous truths of the third angel's message, be faithful, while passing the "quickly." Your warfare is drawing to a close. "Endure persecution." "The trial of your faith, is more precious than fine gold, though it be tried in the fire." You are doing a great work, I trust that the Lord will not suffer you to be hindered. Yours in the love of the truth.

LUTHER PAINE.

Ware Village, Mass., July 8th. 1854.

COMMUNICATIONS.

From Bro. and Sr. Tallman.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—We feel to rejoice in the glorious hope of the restitution of all things, spoken of by all the holy prophets since the world began. And when we read the communications from the brethren and sisters through the *Review*, we feel to rejoice and praise God that others are also cheered with the same blessed hope of soon seeing Jesus, and being made like him; to dwell in his presence and behold his glory, where sin, sorrow and death is ended, and all tears are wiped away, is enough to encourage and strengthen all his believing children, everywhere to faithfulness in the service of God.

While looking at the signs of the times, and the fulfillment of prophecy, and the opposition that is manifested against keeping the commandments of God, we feel to thank and praise God for the truth; and their (supposed) evidence against us seems to strengthen and confirm us, that we are in the faith once delivered to the saints.

I am well aware that your paper with its precious contents, often falls into the hands of those who are opposed to the present truth, and the third angel's message; and because we thus write, rejoicing in God and his truth, and the glory soon to be revealed, they think we are boasting. God forbid! yet if we boast or glory, let it not be to ourselves but unto the Lord, through Jesus Christ, for the glory that is soon to be revealed from heaven, to all his people in every age and every clime. Praise the Lord; for glory, honor, and power belongs unto the Lord our God who made the heavens and earth, and sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day from all the

works which he had made; wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it. This blessing we think has not been removed to the first day.

Yours in the faith of the gospel, of soon getting the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark.

LEBBEUS TALLMAN.

POLLY TALLMAN.

Delona, Sauk Co., Wis., June 25th, 1854.

From Bro. Hardy.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I have been a reader of the *Review* since some time in February last, and am happy to say that wherein I was then blind, now I see. I thank the Lord that he has heard and answered prayer in behalf of the truth, and in sending his servants with food in due season. The Lord be praised for his excellency, and for giving unto us, unworthy as we are, the assurance that the keeping of the commandments of God is the whole duty of man.

When Bro. Gould first came to my house, it was on Sabbath evening. I was at my work as usual, when we began to converse upon the Scriptures; and after speaking upon several topics, he asked, what day was the Bible Sabbath. Ans. Seventh day. He asked, Why, then, I kept the first day. Ans. Because Christ arose on that day. Suffice it to say, wherever I looked for an answer, I found it different from what I had supposed, and all the passages produced evidence against a change of the Sabbath. And further, not only was I ignorant on the Sabbath question, but, in fact, on many others. I knew nothing of the prophecies, or in what age of the world we lived. Our Watchmen are indolent, and begin to say, "My Lord delayeth his coming," and are eating and drinking with the drunken.

On the next day after the conversation with Bro. Gould, I went to meeting, and commenced conversing with one of the brethren about the Sabbath. I asked if there was one passage of scripture for the change, when he said that there was. I then asked if he would tell me where to find it. He referred me to John xx, 19. I then asked if that meeting made a Sabbath of that day, and he said I was the first man that he had ever heard say anything to the contrary, and that I must be turning Jew, or else must be crazy. I tried to reason with them, but they would not talk with me at all. I then told them if there was any such scripture, to tell me where to find it, that I might be satisfied. But no answer. I then went home with a heavy heart, determined, however, to search the scriptures for myself, and walk in the light as far as I knew. And by searching and praying, I was soon led to see the truth. And praise the God of our salvation for courage to take up my cross, and follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.

JOHN A. HARDY.

Lawrenceburg, Dearborn Co., Ind., July 9th, 1854.

From Bro. Stiles.

DEAR BRO. WHITE:—I am often led at the return of the holy Sabbath, to exclaim, how good is God, in giving the Sabbath to man, that he may rest from the toils and cares of this life, and be refreshed in body and mind. But those only who keep the Sabbath holy unto the Lord can be truly refreshed in mind.

I feel to rejoice in God that he ever gave me a desire to do his will, and by his Holy Spirit led me to strive to keep all of his commandments, and the faith or testimony of his dear Son, knowing that if I do these things with singleness of heart, I shall have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city.

I spent the last Sabbath with my uncle and aunt, (D. & L. Richmond,) at Greenbush, Clinton Co., Mich., who are striving to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; and we have been refreshed together. I believe that God has other jewels in this place, and if some faithful messenger would come here and set forth the present truth in its true light, they would gladly receive it.

ORA B. STILES.

Green Bush, Clinton Co., Mich., July 2d, 1854.

Extracts of Letters.

BRO. H. W. LAWRENCE writes from Norfolk, July 7th, 1854:—"Last Sabbath and First-day, I spent with the friends in Watson. They feel the need of having the servants of God pass that way, who can give the household "meat in due season." There are honest souls in other places in Lewis Co., who can be benefited by the present truth.

"I feel thankful for the late conference at Rochester, and the strength gained; also for my safe return among the tried friends of the cause in St. Lawrence Co."

BRO. WM. GOULD writes from Lawrenceburg, Dearborn Co., Ind., July 9th, 1854:—"We should be glad to have some of the preaching brethren come

this way and give us a few lectures, as there are some here who have lately embraced the truth, and are keeping the Sabbath who have never heard a lecture on present truth.

"In looking over the last *Review*, I notice that there has been different arrangements made by the Conference in regard to the price and payment of the paper. It is certainly now very low. If all will comply with the conditions immediately, you will be enabled to know how many paying subscribers you have to commence with. Dear Brother, I have received the paper regularly. It is a welcome messenger. I rejoice while reading the cheering letters from the dear brethren and sisters."

Bro. H. Bingham writes from Morristown, Vt.:—"The ears of many seem to be opening to the truth. A few have embraced it in Stowe, Morristown, and Johnson. Yesterday I attended meeting at Johnson, and was cheered to hear from three who have lately embraced the hope."

SPIRITUALISM.

"But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily [Private Circles] shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." 2 Pet. ii, 1.

"When they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them." 1 Thess. v, 3.

"Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit," &c. Chap. xviii, 2.

"Whose [Christ's] coming is after [immediately following] the working of Satan with all power, and signs and lying wonders." 2 Thess. ii, 9.

"And shall show great signs and wonders, inasmuch, that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. xxiv, 24.

Babylon the Habitation of Devils.

A CLERGYMAN, a Spiritualist of Phillipston, Mass., writing to the *Spiritual Telegraph*, says:—"For five years I have preached these same views as fast and as far as they have been communicated to my mind; and although the wolves have sometime howled, still the people have heard me gladly. There is a power exercised over me in the pulpit (or through me) of which I am unconscious elsewhere, and as yet no voice has been raised within or without the church to silence me."

Machine Invented by Spirits.

MESSRS. PARTRIDGE AND BRITTON:

Gentlemen—From a sense of duty, and to "give credit to whom credit is due," I offer the following announcement relative to the discovery (through Spirit agency) of a machine for the riving of shingles.

On the 2d day of March, Dr. R. Barrow was entranced to give the description, and also a draft of this machine, under the influence of Dr. Franklin. The draft was completed in an incredibly short space of time, and that, too, without the aid of any mathematical instruments, save a straight stick and pencil. On taking off the draft to a working size, the proportions were all found correct, and could not be varied to any improvement. The direction was that the draft and specification should be handed over to me to execute; which I have done accordingly, at such leisure hours as could be spared from other business.

The model completed is of one third the full working size, and works precisely as was promised. It produces from the block a shingle each second of time, including the time required to remove the shingle from the machine and the replacing of the bolts upon the carriage. But I will not burden your columns with an extended account of this truly useful and labor-saving machine, as it will soon find its way to the pineries, where manufacturers of shingles will duly appreciate its value. The machine is clearly patentable, and in due time will be entered at the Patent Office.

I will simply add that Dr. Barrow makes no pretension to any knowledge of the mechanic arts, and in the normal state could not have made the first mark or entertained the least idea of the construction of the machine.

I am, gentlemen, your obedient servant.

H. C. BILLINGS.

Palmer, Hampden Co., Mass., April 15th, 1854.

FOREIGN NEWS.

EUROPE.—The symptoms of a commercial and industrial crisis begin to assume a serious aspect. A terrible re-action has opened. Thus we find in the Leeds and London papers of this week the announcement of heavy failures in the worsted trade of Bradford in Yorkshire. A long catalogue of firms is given consigned to total ruin.

THE LATEST DISPATCHES.

By Submarine and European Telegraph.

PARIS, Tuesday morning, June 27, 1854.—The *Moniteur* announces that, according to a dispatch received from Vienna, dated yesterday, the siege of Silistria had been raised, and that the Russians were retiring en masse.

Their retreat was being effected from all parts of Wallachia, in the direction of Fokshan and Birlat.

The entry of the Austrians into the Principalities is decided on, and Count Coronini, with the first division, to be followed closely by a second, is ready to descend the Danube to Giurgevo, whence he will march to Bucharest.

M. de Bruck is to communicate with the Porte as to the steps necessary to be taken with a view to this occupation of the Principalities by the Austrians.

We have received from our correspondent in Berlin a dis-

patch, dated last night, which announces that the smaller German States have sent in their complete adhesion to the Austro-Prussian treaty.

Letters from the Danube mention that the Russians are leaving their sick behind in the hospitals, and the most stringent orders have been given by the Turkish authorities to respect them, and also to deliver free passports to the Russian Surgeon who may be left in attendance.

VIENNA, Monday Morning, June 26.—The night before last the Russian reply to the Austrian note reached Vienna. It is to the effect that, as a mark of high consideration for Austria, Russia consents to evacuate the Turkish territories.

BUCHAREST, Friday, June 23, 1854.—The siege of Silistria is raised "by superior order." The Russians have evacuated Giurgevo, and the whole of the army is to retire beyond the Pruth.

CRONSTADT, (Transylvania) June 19, 1854.—The Russians are leaving Wallachia in all haste. They take with them the horses, oxen, wheat, and every thing movable on which they can lay their hands, leaving nothing behind but their wretched paper money.

BUCHAREST, June 15.—The march of a British detachment from Varna to Pravad, on the 12th inst., was announced on the same day to the commander of the Russian corps of observation stationed below Basardjik by Cossacks. The Russian corps at once commenced a movement in retreat.

CONSTANTINOPLE, June 15.—The advance guard of the allied army has reached Pravad, between Varna and Shumla. Generals Bosquet and d'Allonville, arrived at Adrianople on the 12th, with 4,000 men.

OSOVA, June 19.—Gen. Librandi's army corps (from 25,000 to 30,000 strong) is retiring from Slatina, to join the concentrations of the Russian forces in Moldavia.

BUCHAREST, June 18.—It is understood that the entire evacuation of the Principalities will be commenced on the 27th.

LIVERPOOL, Wednesday, June 28, 1854.—The Continental news is very scanty. There is no fresh intelligence from the East.

LONDON, 28th June—Noon.—We have nothing later from the East, except that the official reply of the Czar to Austria would not be sent till the second or third of July.

The Russians have taken prisoners two newspaper correspondents, on the right bank of the Danube.

Constantinople letters of the 19th confirm the news that the Austrians will occupy the Principalities till the conclusion of a general peace.

It is said that the Western Powers will promote the raising of a loan of 400,000,000 piastres by the Porte. The Russians have removed their heavy artillery from the Danube islands.

P. S.—The Asia, which arrived on Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock, brings nothing more decisive from Europe. The Russians are retreating from the Principalities, and the Austrians are about to enter. Lord John Russell said in the House of Commons that if the Russians had not withdrawn, the Austrians were bound by the late treaty with the Porte, to march in and drive them out. This, however, looks doubtful. Gen. Schilders is dead, and Prince Menschikoff has been appointed to command the army in conjunction with Paskievitch. The Russians are not only withdrawing to the Pruth, but are making preparations in the Crimea, as if for a defensive war. On the other hand the allies seem to be preparing to attack them there. In Circassia the mountaineers actually have possession of the Gates of the Caucasus, and Woronzoff is out off from communicating with Russia by that route. The Turks are about to advance on Tiflis in conjunction with Shamyl. Persia has declared herself neutral. The Greek insurrection is completely put down, the last of its leaders having surrendered. Admiral Napier has concentrated his forces before Cronstadt, and the English hope he will do something.

SPAIN.—Advices have been received from Spain up to the 23d ult. At that time not the slightest evidence had been shown by the Spanish Government of a disposition to come to an arrangement in the Cuban difficulty. No overtures whatever have been made which could be accepted by the United States Government.

It must be regarded as almost certain, that France will not assist Spain in a war with the United States.

TENT MEETING.

A TENT MEETING will be held on the farm of Z. W. Leach in Waitsfield Vermont, on the road leading from Moretown to Waitsfield Common. The Meeting will commence July 21st, and continue over the Sabbath and First-day, and longer if thought best. We shall expect that the brethren will come to the Meeting with provisions for themselves. There will be two small tents on the ground in which those who have provision and bedding can be accommodated. There will be provision made for horses.

We would invite Bra. Baker, Sperry, Wheeler and other preaching brethren to come and labor with us.

There will also be a Tent Meeting at Sutton, Vt., on the farm of Bro. S. Willey, to commence July 28th, and continue over Sabbath and First-day, and longer if thought best. A general attendance is expected.

JOSIAH HART,

E. P. BUTLER,

H. BINGHAM,

ALBERT STONE,

Committee
of arrangements.

Tent Meeting at Jackson.

Providence permitting we will hold a Tent Meeting in the village of Jackson, Mich., commencing July 28th, at 5 o'clock P. M., and hold over Sabbath and First-day J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.
M. E. CORNELL.

MONEY designed to pay for Vol. VI, will be receipted in No. 1, of Vol. VI. Several have recently sent donations for the *Review*, a part of which we have receipted, and a part is reserved to be receipted in No. 1 of Vol. VI. There are two more Nes. after this, in this Vol., and according to

present receipts, this Vol. will fall short one hundred dollars. Once more we invite the friends of truth, who have taken the *Review* for some time past, to send in their donations for this Vol., with the small price for the *Review* one year. We hope our readers will be prompt to comply with the terms of the *Review*.

Business.

E. S. Lane:—The Tracts have all been sent according to direction.

N. A. Hollis:—The letter containing the \$2.00, has not been received.

Publications.

THE Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days—76 pp.—8 cts.—postage 1 cent.

Review of O. R. L. Crozier—the Sabbath—48 pp.—5 cts. A Refutation of Claims of Sunday-keeping, . . . History of the Sabbath—40 pp.—5 cts.—postage 1 cent.

The Signs of the Times; Spirit Manifestations a sign that the day of wrath hasteth greatly—124 pp.—10 cts.—postage 1 ct.

The Two-horned beast, the United States—52 pp.—5 cents

Advent and Sabbath Hymns—30 cts.—postage 5 cts.

Supplement to Advent and Sabbath Hymns—5 cents.

Time and Prophecy—a Poem—25 cents—postage 5 cents

A Word for the Sabbath—a Poem—6 cents.

First Day of the Week Not the Sabbath—32 pp.—3 cts.—

The Seventh Day is the Sabbath—32 pp.—3 cts.

History of the Sabbath—40 pp.—4 cents.

The 2300 days and the Sanctuary—32 pp.—3 cents.

Christian Experience and Views—6 cents.

Supplement to Experience and Views—6 cents.

Solemn Appeal—Speedy Coming of Christ—32 pp.—3 cts.

True Picture—state of the Churches—16 pp.

The Sabbath by Elihu—16 pp.

Both Sides—on the Sabbath—16 pp.

The Sabbath by P. Miller Jr.—16 pp.

First-day of the week not the Sabbath—16 pp.

Review of Objections to the Sabbath—16 pp.

New Time Theory Reviewed—16 pp.

Tracts of 16 pages each can be sent by mail for one half cent an ounce, in packages of not less than 8 ounces.

Sabbath and Advent Miscellany—seven of the above Tracts bound with paper covers—10 cents—postage 1 cent.

Volumes I—IV of the *Review*, bound in paper covers, Vols. and II, 40 cents; Vols. III and IV, 75 cents.

Youth's Instructor, Vol. I, in paper covers—25 cents.

AGENTS.

MAINE.		RHODE ISLAND.	
N. N. Lunt,	Portland.	Ransom Hicks,	Providence.
S. W. Flanders,	Canaan.	NEW YORK.	
Cyprian Stevens,	Paris.	J. Byington,	Buck's Bridge.
S. Howland,	Topsham.	A. Ross,	Caughdenoy.
W. T. Hanniford,	Orrington.	David Upson,	Moreland.
Wm. Bryant,	Wilton.	R. F. Cottrell,	Mill Grove.
NEW HAMPSHIRE.		John Wager,	Orangeport.
J. Stowell,	Washington.	L. Carpenter,	Oswego.
S. Bunnell,	Claremont.	A. H. Robinson,	Sandy Creek.
MASSACHUSETTS.		E. A. Poole,	Lincklaen.
O. Nichols,	Dorchester.	J. A. Loughhead,	Elmira.
O. Davis,	N. Fairhaven.	John Hamilton,	Fredonia.
Wm. Saxby,	Springfield.	PENNSYLVANIA.	
VERMONT.		M. L. Dean,	Ulysses.
R. Loveland,	Johnson.	J. H. Heggie,	Alleghany.
H. Bingham,	Morristown.	MICHIGAN.	
S. H. Peck,	Wolcott.	Albert Avery,	Locke.
Lewis Bean,	Hardwick.	Ira Gardner,	Vergennes.
Edwin Churchill,	Stowe.	David Hewett,	Battle Creek.
E. P. Butler,	Waterbury.	C. S. Glover,	Sylvan.
Josiah Hart,	Northfield.	A. B. Pearsall,	Grand Rapids.
R. G. Lookwood,	Waitsfield.	A. A. Dodge,	Jackson.
Jesse Barrows,	Irasburg.	Wm. M. Smith,	"
Alonzo Lee,	Derby Line.	A. C. Morton,	Delhi.
E. Everts,	Vergennes.	WISCONSIN.	
H. Gardner,	Panton.	E. S. Sheffield,	Koskonong.
S. Willey,	Wheelock.	T. R. Sheldon,	Rosendale.
CONNECTICUT.		CANADA EAST.	
EL H Chamberlain,	Md'town.	B. Hills,	Melbourne.
A. Belden,	Kensington.		

Letters.

L. J. Richmond 2, M. E. Cornell 2, J. B. Bezzo, B. B. Brigham, A. Kellogg.

Receipts.

G. R. Cooper, S. Sparks, B. Madill, D. R. Wood, L. Paine, C. L. Gilbert, each \$1.
J. M. Avery \$3; C. Robinson \$0.67; J. Spalding \$0.75;
D. P. Williams, Sr. Wood, each \$0.50; J. R. Towle, \$0.36;
H. Towle, M. M. Towle, each \$0.25.

THE REVIEW AND HERALD

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY

At South St. Paul Street, Stone's Block,
No. 23 Third Floor.

J. N. ANDREWS, R. F. COTTRELL, URIAH SMITH,
Publishing Committee.

JAMES WHITE, Editor.

TERMS—One Dollar a Year, in advance.

All communications, orders, and remittances should be addressed to JAMES WHITE Rochester, N. Y. 109 Monroe Street, (post-paid.)