

The Advent Review

AND HERALD OF THE SABBATH.

"Here is the patience of the Saints: Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

VOLUME 44.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JULY 14, 1874.

NUMBER 5.

The Review and Herald

IS ISSUED WEEKLY BY

The Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

ELDER JAMES WHITE, PRESIDENT.

TERMS: TWO DOLLARS A YEAR IN ADVANCE. When paid by Tract Societies or individuals for the poor, or to other persons for investigation, \$1.00 per year.

Address REVIEW & HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

"WE SHALL BE LIKE HIM."

We shall be like Him, oh, beautiful thought!
Well may our souls into rapture be wrought.
After the sorrows, the woe, and the tears,
We shall be like Him when Jesus appears.

After the conflict in peace to sit down,
After the cross to be wreathed with the crown,
After the dust and the soil of the way,
With Him and like Him forever to stay.

Never again shall the throbbing head ache,
Never again shall the beating heart break,
Never the task drop from wearying hands,
Nor the feet ever fail in that brightest of lands.

Never shall sin with the trail of its shame
Shadow love's sunlight, nor chill its clear flame;
Saviour, oft grieved in the house of thy friends,
Ne'er will we wound thee when earth's frail life ends.

Death! 'tis this thought does away with thy sting,
Makes us triumphant to meet thee and sing,
"Glory to God." When the Jordan is passed
We shall go home and be like Him at last.

Master, alas! thee we've often denied;
When the world scorned, we have shrunk from
thy side;
Yet, blessed Jesus, thou knowest thy love,
Pardon and help us with grace from above.

When thou appearest, oh, rapturous thought!
Well may our souls into rapture be wrought,
We shall be like thee when this life is o'er,
Wound thee, deny thee, offend thee, no more.

—Sel.

WHO CHANGED THE SABBATH?

TIME was when the first day of the week was not observed as a Christian institution. Allowing it the utmost antiquity which its most fervent friends will claim, we cannot go back beyond the resurrection of our Saviour, not eighteen hundred and fifty years ago. Previous to that time, another day, the seventh day of the week, was observed as the Sabbath by that people whom God had set apart to preserve a knowledge of himself and of his truth in the earth.

While some confusion of ideas prevails in regard to what effect the change from the Jewish to the gospel dispensation has had upon the Sabbath, some believing it to be unaffected, and others supposing it to have been abolished, the majority believe that it has been changed. And so we find in all Catholic and Protestant countries, that all who keep any Sabbath at all, excepting a few who keep the seventh day, observe the first day of the week. And most of them do it on the ground that this day occupies in this dispensation the same position that the seventh day occupied in the old, and that its observance rests upon the same authority.

This is certainly a very remarkable change. And the bare suggestion that this change is not in accordance with the will of God, nor in harmony with his word is enough to raise the query in very many minds. How then has it come about? Who has thus changed the Sabbath? By what means has this revolution been accomplished? And not a few attempt to forestall all inquiry on this point, by claiming that the fact that such a change has been made, is itself sufficient evidence that God has wrought it.

But this is altogether too hasty a conclusion; for Satan has not been asleep these eighteen hundred years; and it has been only by the most diligent care that anything has been preserved to the Christian church free from the taint of fatal corruption.

It is not the object of this article to enter

into an examination of any of the Scriptural evidences for or against the change; for this would involve an extended discussion of the Sabbath question from a Bible point of view; nor is it designed to show the particular steps by which the change has been brought about; for this would involve an examination of the history of the Sabbath from apostolic times. We only inquire here respecting the agent or power which has been employed in this work. Most Protestants claim that this change was made by Christ and his apostles. But a rival claim to the honor of this work here comes in from the man of sin, the papacy; hence the issue; and it becomes a very important point, and one which has quite a bearing on the character of the institution, to determine whose work it is—that of Christ or Antichrist.

It will be conceded on all hands that a change of the Sabbath involves a change of what is usually regarded as the moral law, that is, the ten commandments, or decalogue. The law which required of Israel the observance of the seventh day of the week, as the fourth commandment certainly did under that dispensation, could not at the same time enjoin upon them the keeping of the first day of the week. Nor can it enjoin this observance upon us, unless it has been so changed as to demand such a service. If there has been no change, it demands of us exactly what it did of Israel.

But if the first day is the divinely appointed Sabbath of the fourth commandment for this dispensation, then the new and unwritten version of the ten commandments for this dispensation so reads as to require the observance of that day.

The question then resolves itself simply into this: Who has changed the law of God? Who was competent to do it? No one except the Father, or his Son who was associated with him in the creation and the government of the world. Respecting the attitude which Christ should bear toward the law of God, the prophet Isaiah says: "He shall magnify the law and make it honorable." Isa. 42:21. To abolish it, as though it was no longer worthy of existence, or to change it, as if it had previously been imperfect, would not magnify it or make it honorable. Christ did neither of these things. Speaking himself of the law of God through the psalmist, he says: "I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart." Ps. 40:8. These expressions denote no hostility on the part of Christ against his Father's law. We are therefore prepared to hear him declare in his very first sermon that he came not to destroy the law, and that not a jot or tittle should pass from it till heaven and earth should pass, nor the smallest fragment should perish, nor the least item be changed, through any work of his.

There is a power, however, brought to view in prophecy, which was to hold a very different relation to God and his law. This power was to speak great and blasphemous words against the Most High, wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws. It is symbolized by the little horn of the fourth beast of Daniel 7; and that symbol all Protestants agree in applying to the papacy.

That power which would blaspheme God, and wear out his saints, would be just the power to undertake to change his law. So the prophet expressly specifies on this point: "he shall think to change times and laws." These laws must certainly be the laws of the Most High. To apply it to human laws, and make the prophecy read, "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change human laws," would be doing evident violence to the language of the prophet. But to apply it to the laws of God, and let it read, "And he shall

speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and shall think to change the times and laws of the Most High"—then all is consistent and forcible. The Septuagint, the Danish, and German Bibles, read, "the law," in the singular, which more directly suggests the law of God. So far as human laws are concerned, the papacy has been able to do more than merely "think" to change them. It has been able to change them at pleasure. It has annulled the decrees of kings and emperors, and absolved subjects from allegiance to their rightful sovereigns. It has thrust its long arm into the affairs of the nations, and brought rulers to its feet in the most abject humility. But the prophet beholds greater acts of presumption than these. He sees it endeavor to do what it was not able to do, but could only think to do; he sees it attempt an act which no man nor any combination of men can ever accomplish; and that is, to change the laws of the Most High. Bear this in mind, while we look at the testimony of another sacred writer on this very point.

Paul speaks of the same power in 2 Thess. 2; and he describes it, in the person of the pope, as the man of sin, and as sitting as God in the temple of God (that is, the church), and as exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped. According to this, the pope sets himself up as the one for all the church to look to for authority, in the place of God. And now we ask the reader to ponder carefully the question how he could exalt himself above God. Search through the whole range of human devices: go to the extent of human effort; by what plan, by what move, by what claim, could this usurper exalt himself above God? He might institute any number of ceremonies, he might prescribe any form of worship, he might exhibit any degree of power; but so long as God had requirements which the people felt bound to regard in preference to his own, so long he would not be above God. He might enact a law and teach the people that they were under as great obligations to that as to the law of God. Then he would only make himself equal with God. But he is to do more than this: he is to attempt to raise himself above him. Then he must promulgate a law which conflicts with the law of God, and demand obedience to his own in preference to God's. There is no other possible way in which he could place himself in the position assigned in the prophecy. But this is simply to change the law of God; and if he can cause this change to be adopted by the people in place of the original enactment, then he, the law-changer, is above God, the law-maker. And this is the very work that Daniel said he should think to do.

We now inquire what change the papacy has undertaken to make in the law of God. By the law of God we mean, as already stated, the moral law, the only law in the universe of immutable and perpetual obligation, the law which Webster says, defining the terms according to the sense in which they are almost universally used in Christendom, "The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue, written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai."

If, now, the reader will compare the ten commandments as found in Roman Catholic catechisms with those commandments as found in the Bible, he will see in the catechisms that the second commandment is left out, that the tenth is divided into two commandments to make up the lack of leaving out the second, and keep good the number ten, and that the fourth commandment (called the third in their enumeration) is made to enjoin the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, and prescribe that the day shall be spent in hearing mass devoutly, attending vespers, and reading moral and pious books.

Here are several variations from the decalogue as found in the Bible. Which of them constitutes the change of the law intended in the prophecy? or, are they all included in that change? Let it be borne in mind that, according to the prophecy, he was to think to change times and laws. This plainly conveys the idea of intention and design, and makes these qualities essential to the change in question. But respecting the omission of the second commandment, Catholics argue that it is included in the first, and, hence, should not be numbered as a separate commandment. And on the tenth, they claim that there is so plain a distinction of ideas as to require two commandments. So they make the coveting of a neighbor's wife, the ninth commandment, and the coveting of his goods, the tenth.

In all this they claim that they are giving the commandments exactly as God intended to have them understood. So, while we may regard them as errors in their interpretation of the commandments, we cannot set them down as intentional changes. Not so, however, with the fourth commandment. Respecting this commandment, they do not claim that their version is like that given by God. They expressly claim a change here, and also that the change has been made by the church. A few quotations from standard Catholic works will make this matter plain.

The following, from Butler's Catechism, shows how the ten commandments are numbered and taught in that church:—

"ON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

"Ques. Say the ten commandments of God.

"Ans. 1. I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt not have strange gods before me, &c. 2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. 3. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. 4. Honor thy father and thy mother. 5. Thou shalt not kill. 6. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 7. Thou shalt not steal. 8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. 9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife. 10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods."

The same catechism then amplifies on the third commandment (the fourth in our enumeration) as follows:—

"THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

"Ques. Say the third commandment.
"Ans. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.

"Q. What is commanded by the third commandment?

"A. To spend the Sunday in prayer and other religious duties.

"Q. Which are the chief duties of religion in which we should spend the Sundays?

"A. Hearing mass devoutly; attending vespers, or evening prayers; reading moral and pious books; and going to communion.

"Q. The hearing of mass, then, is not sufficient to sanctify Sunday?

"A. No; a part of the day should also be given to prayer and good works."—Butler's Catechism, p. 26.

In the "Catholic Catechism of Christian Religion," further instruction is given on the third (fourth) commandment, with the authority for the change as shown by the following questions and answers:—

"Ques. What does God ordain by this commandment?

"Ans. He ordains that we sanctify, in a special manner, this day on which he rested from the labor of creation.

"Q. What is this day of rest?

"A. The seventh day of the week, or Saturday; for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh. Gen. 2:2; Heb. 4:1, &c.

"Q. Is it, then, Saturday we should sanctify in order to obey the ordinance of God?

"A. During the old law, Saturday was

The Lisbon Earthquake.

A FEARFUL TRAGEDY OF THE LAST CENTURY.

[The following is the most impressive description of the great event that marked the opening of the sixth seal, Rev. 6:12, that we have ever seen.—ED. REVIEW.]

The morning of Nov. 1, 1755, dawned serene, but the heavens were hazy. Since midnight the thermometer had risen 1 degree, and stood at 9 o'clock at 14 above freezing, Reaumer. As it was the feast of All-saints, the churches were thronged from an early hour, and all their altars brilliantly illuminated with thousands of tapers, and decorated with garlands of various tinted muslin and thin silk. At a quarter of 10 o'clock, the first shock was felt. It was so slight that many persons attributed it to the passage of heavy wagons in the street, and even to mere fancy. Three minutes afterward, a second shock occurred, so violent that it seemed as if the heavens and earth were passing away. This agitation lasted fully ten minutes, and ere it diminished, the greater portion of the city was in ruins. The dust raised obscured the sun; an Egyptian darkness prevailed, and to add to the universal horror, the fearful screams of the living and the groans of the dying rose through the air.

In twenty minutes all became calm again, and people began to look around them, and consider the best means of escape. Some were for going to the hills, but were soon discouraged from so doing by the rumors that those who had already gone thither were suffocating from the effects of the dense fog of dust which still rose from the falling buildings. Then they rushed toward the quays which line a part of the Tagus, but only to learn the horrible news that these had sunk into the earth, with all the people and edifices upon them.

Those who thought to put to sea were told to look at the river, and lo! in its center they beheld a whirlpool which was sucking in all the vessels and boats in its vicinity, not a fragment of any of them being ever seen again. The royal palace had been entirely swallowed up, and over its site is now the vast square of the Baco, or Black Horse, one of the largest public places in Europe. The great library of the Holy Ghost was in flames, and its priceless Moorish and Hebrew manuscripts were fast becoming ashes. The opera-house had fallen in, the Inquisition was no more, and the great church of San Domingo was a heap of stones, beneath which lay crushed to atoms the entire congregation. The Irish church of St. Paul was the death place of a thousand persons, and the palace of Bomposta, where Catherine of Braganza, widow of Charles II., lived and died, had fallen over from the heights on which it was built, and utterly destroyed the poor but populous part of the town which lay beneath it. In a word, where but an hour since was Lisbon was now nothing but desolation. As to the people, who can describe their condition? At least 70,000 persons had perished, and the majority of the survivors were cruelly wounded and in an agony of mind and body. Some went mad with fright, some lost forever the power of speech, sinners went about confessing their secret crimes, and fanatics, believing the last day had come, cried out to the horror-stricken multitude "to repent, for that Christ was coming to judge the quick and the dead."

As the day waxed on, the wretched Lisbonese grew calmer, and it was universally declared that the safest places, now that the dust was diminishing, were the heights overlooking the city, and thither the majority fled. Here they found the Court assembled, for the Royal family was fortunately at Belem, where, strange to say, the earthquake was scarcely felt at all, and had hastened at once to the hills. The Cardinal-Patriarch was here also, and so was Pombal; and these two men, with surprising presence of mind, by their admirable courage, were enabled before night to inspire some feeling of order in the excited throng. The King and Queen behaved nobly, and the young Duke of Lafoens deserves to be immortalized for his splendid conduct. He organized a band of noblemen who went about aiding the wounded, rescuing the children, and even burying the dead.

It was a strange and awful sight to see this multitude gather together on the summit of the hills which once overlooked

their magnificent capital, and which now looked down upon a mere mass of smoldering ruins. As day declined and night came on, the Cardinal issued a proclamation, ordering all to kneel in prayer and entreat the mercy of God upon them, and then rose on the air the wailing tone of that saddest of psalms, the Miserere. When the shades of night had fully fallen, a frightful discovery was made; the city was in flames in a hundred places. The conflagration was greatly increased by a strong wind blowing in from the sea. There was now no hope of saving anything, and it was but too well known that thousands of human beings who had taken refuge in the cellars and crypts were being roasted alive.

But if the anxiety of the escaped was dreadful to witness, the scenes within the city itself were even more terrible. Robbers, escaped jail-birds, low sailors, and degraded negroes, formed bands, and went about amidst the ruins pillaging the wounded of their trinkets, and even murdering those who ventured to oppose their ghastly deeds. The lewd inhabitants of the brothels broke from the rigid restraint in which they were confined by the law and joined the bandits. They plundered such of the wine-stores as were left intact, and maddened with drink and probably with terror, cast off their garments, and went dancing and whooping blasphemous songs through the desolate streets, if such they could now be called, while the lurid light from the innumerable fires cast a blood-colored glow on their naked and contorted forms. They got into the churches, robbed the sacred images, threw the holy vestments over their shoulders, and made the ruined walls re-echo the shouts of their beastly revelry. "It seemed," says Tray Bernando de Carmo, "as if hell had vomited forth its demons, and that the powers of darkness had indeed prevailed."

From the cellars of the houses rose the piercing cries of those who were perishing of their neglected wounds, or suffering from the effects of foul atmosphere. Here a mother wept over the bodies of her children; there a group of timid nuns stood around their Abbess and knew not which way to turn; now a fanatic rushed along howling dismal prophecies; now a long file of white-clad Cistercians passed by reciting mournful prayers; and then again fell upon the ear the horrid maniacal laughter of the gang of lewd women and brutal men at their dreadful revelry. An aged noble woman in full court garments was seen searching among the ruins of her palace for her jewels; and a famous Phryne of the day, Theresa Brandoo, suddenly converted, did such noble deeds of charity that her name deserves to be written in letters of gold.

For fifteen days was the city infested with robbers, until Carvalho, afterward the celebrated Minister Pombal, set an example of courage and energy. He descended into Lisbon, and remained days and nights together in his carriage or on horseback, directing affairs and assisting in clearing away the ruins; he planted soldiers all over the city, and whoever could not give a clear account of the property found in his possession was hung then and there, and three hundred and fifty-seven persons thus perished. Many months elapsed ere tranquillity was in a measure restored, and before the people began to think of rebuilding their homes. Indeed, it was at one time almost decided to remove the capital to Rio de Janeiro.—Lippincott for July.

More Objections, or the Cross in the Way.

A FIRST-DAY Adventist lately said to me that he had been almost persuaded to keep the Sabbath. He seemed friendly to our people, having formerly been connected in business with one of our brethren whom he much esteemed. He appeared to be doing a pretty good business, and perhaps thinks keeping the Sabbath will interfere with it. Said he had read the debate between Elders Grant and Cornell, and had come to the conclusion that it is right to obey the laws of the land, and to live in obedience to the "powers that be." He then said Christ had fulfilled the law, therefore we are not under it. The law simply brought us to Christ, &c.

After he had done speaking, I calmly replied to him by proving that so far as human law is founded upon, and accords with, God's law, it is right, and should be obeyed; but when it plainly conflicts, we are under no obligation to obey it. To prove this, I quoted the language of Peter and John to the rulers, elders, scribes, and the high

priest, when they commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Acts 4:18, 19. "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15:9.

When our government makes a law requiring us to worship the image (which is not far in the future), it is plain to a reasonable mind that we are not bound to obey it. If human law is to be obeyed in preference to the law of God, millions of martyrs have died in vain.

It will not do to take the position that Christ fulfilled the law in the sense of bringing it to an end, abolishing, or destroying, it. How will it do to give it this meaning in the following texts? "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill [abolish] all righteousness." Matt. 3:15. "For all the law is fulfilled [abolished] in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Eph. 5:14. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill [abolish] the law of Christ." Gal. 6:2.

The evident meaning of fulfill in these texts is to accomplish or carry out. When Christ said he came not to destroy the law but to fulfill, Matt. 5:17, he did not mean that since he had come there was no longer any need of a law, and that he was the end in the sense of a termination, as no-law men would have it; for the first part of the text plainly teaches the contrary. It says he came not to destroy. It is plain that our Saviour came to do his Father's will, to establish, magnify the law and make it honorable. Isa. 42:21. In his sermon on the mount he clearly recognized it when he taught, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments [his Father's], and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." Matt. 5:19.

When will men cease their quibblings and frivolous objections concerning the law of God, and their duty to keep it? Some never will, until the storms of God's wrath overtake them, and they see their awful folly. Now is the time to seek refuge from the storm that is soon coming, by fleeing to the ark of God, keeping his commandments and the faith of Jesus.

WM. PENNIMAN.

Divorces

Are increasing to an alarming extent. An old resident of this county recently observed to me with much feeling, that divorces were becoming so frequent in Ohio, and were obtained on such frivolous pretexts, and the laws were so favorable to this, that it threatened the loss of all public virtue; and this man was not one who viewed the matter from a prophetic, but rather from a practical stand point.

You will find men who are considered pillars in society who apply for divorce from less than the Scripture reason; and who have long nurtured the intention of divorce, but have only waited for the maturity of children to release themselves from the scolding wife, whose irascible temper has been lacerated to the core by the knowledge of the fact that such an intention existed for a long period of time.

Such a state of things has a tendency to let down the standard and to form in the public mind an idea that marriage is only a civil contract, to be dissolved at any time, either by mutual consent, or by private whim or pretext, whenever a desire to do so should become strong enough to apply to the court for an act of divorce.

What can be more mischievous to the public morals than such a state of things, if for years a man of character may harbor in his mind the thought that the virtuous, laborious mother, whose life has been devoted to the domestic care of his household, and who has been the companion of his choice, may harbor such an intention in his heart, and hold it over the head of the poor victim until she become a very vixen and demoniac. How beautiful the rule laid down by our Lord and Saviour, that only one cause should justify his people for granting authority for divorce.

The family relation is, in fact, when rightfully understood, a reformatory institution, and should be so viewed by its members. How does the husband know what his example and patient fortitude and unwearied love may effect for his impatient wife? Or what may not the pa-

tient and meek and gentle wife not effect for the irascible temper of her companion? Or, failing in this, these fruitless, unselfish labors will win bright laurels for the victor when the Judge shall arrange his jewels; for no unselfish act shall lose its reward.

But alas how selfish is the heart that will anticipate such a thing as divorce without just and wholesome reasons, and irrefragable proofs of guilt. Read Malachi 2:13-17, and take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously.

JOS. CLARKE.

Increase of European Armies.

WE have repeatedly commented, in these columns, on the increase of the total number of soldiers in the armies of Europe. To the fact of increase there is not a single exception; even England has since 1859 nearly doubled her forces. The Berlin correspondent of the London Times has prepared a table of the present armaments of the European powers as compared with those of 1859, a period of fifteen years. The total army of Austria has advanced from 634,000 to 856,980; of Russia, from 1,134,200 to 1,401,510; of Italy, from 317,650 to 605,200; of Germany, from 836,000 to 1,261,160; of France, from 640,500 to 977,600; of England, from 245,800 to 478,820. We will not go over the list for the minor States, but it demonstrates that all Europe moves in the same direction. The crown of its civilization is war. With such facts before us, we cannot hope for progress toward a more peaceful era. The highest proportion of soldiers to each million of inhabitants is reached by Germany, 36,815; next comes Denmark with 30,392; next France, with 29,059; and, far behind, England with 16,088. These are the numbers of soldiers enrolled, drilled, and available for service; they are divided into those liable to duty in offensive war, and those subject to service at home. But the magnitude of the preparations for offensive war is seen from the fact that this part of the German army reaches the total of 710,130 men, of the Russian 665,810, Italian 322,000, and the French, 525,000. Von Moltke said last winter that what Germany had won in six months she must keep by watchfulness and "the hand on the sword" for fifty years. This means liability to hostilities at any moment.

This is an uneasy mode of living, but Europe knows no better, and despairs of any other. We live here in America by the side of two powers, both of inferior numerical strength, but on peaceful terms. Our one war of conquest, beneficial as were its results, our best thinkers have been heartily ashamed of. Now that the slave-power is gone, we shall not be likely to see such another. We may well prefer our peace to all of Europe's "glory." It is entirely consistent that Prince Gortschakoff should issue a call for an International Congress at Brussels on the 15th of July. As war is always imminent among them, it is wise in the nations of Europe to agree to place it under well-defined limitations. Even the trade of destruction is susceptible of mitigation, and should have better defined rules for the protection of private property and of peaceful populations. We may accept these mitigations till Europe shall agree to disarm.—The Methodist.

The Right Persuasion.

IN terrible agony, a soldier lay dying in the hospital. A visitor asked him: "What church are you of?" "Of the church of Christ," he replied. "I mean, of what persuasion are you?" "Persuasion!" said the dying man, as his eyes looked heavenward, beaming with love to the Saviour, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate me from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus."

WHEN the hospital was out of the city far up town, the late Rev. Wm. Parkinson, of this city, had twenty-one candidates to baptize, and about one thousand people assembled to witness what was then a novel scene. A man attempted to disturb the solemnity of the occasion by riding his horse into the water, as one of the candidates was led in; but the horse, as if aware of the impropriety, threw the rider into the water and walked out, trotting away, while the ceremony was completed without further interruption.

