

might. Peter's answer does not at all imply that he favored fermented beverages. According to tradition, Peter, James and John were in hearty sympathy with the Nazarenes and Rechabites. Peter was a positive temperance man. 1 Peter 1: 13; 4: 3-7; 5: 8; 2 Peter 1: 6.

SO MAKING PEACE.

Bro. C. J. Wright:

Having smoked my pipe you ought to speak in "kindness." Jonah was whaled because he didn't preach a little; I am whaled because I made a little preach. Perverse times these. I confess I am a mere tyro in the Bible and in print. So I proceeded in my perhaps unfortunate criticism by asking pardon and questions. I asked if my understanding was correct, in these words—Am I right? You do not answer this question. You seem to swell up with surprise, but do not defend your language in the original article which I quoted. You say you do not "fully" understand my meaning. Are you sincere? I, after asking if I understood aright, presented this: "Do you see? You make it a Christian's duty not to bear the fruit of holiness, but to do over again the form of doctrine delivered." Now this was a "position" if I properly understood you. You address yourself to the readers of the HERALD denying me the courtesy of a perfect understanding, from which I conclude my thought of your meaning was correct. This courtesy even civilized enemies accord each other. Well-bred people are particular in this matter to their inferiors.

You do not "fully" understand me. That little word fully misleads the casual reader, for which purpose it was inserted, I candidly believe. Baptists, a very commendable body of Christian people, hold baptism as a Christian duty because of remission of sins or of previous forgiveness. So your little departure was not such a crime against received opinion as to justify evasion like that. Since the publication of my former address Bro. Ashley S. Johnson's Great Controversy came in my way. Your error was worthy of his notice. On page 72 he says: "I do not read of baptism as a 'Christian duty,' but as an obligation resting alone on the penitent believer." My criticism, exactly, in different language, and I cited Rom. 6: 20, to prove it.

Errors sometimes are productive of good. This one has been of much benefit to me, and I think you should be rather glad than otherwise that somebody, particularly tyros, read for a purpose. My regret is that such dodging the main point debars that accord of the virtues of sincerity and candor, of so much weight in a Bible teacher and which by myself are held in almost idocratic reverence. The head carpenter ought to lay out the work, but I am not afraid to take "position."

1. It is not a Christian duty or debt, to be baptized. Why? Because Christian duties are imposed after entrance into Christ's church or kingdom, which is by being baptized into it.

2. The import of your first piece was, that two sets of conditions must be complied with to be in the fellowship of a church (congregation) which you corroborate in your address to the HERALD readers in the supposed case half way between two churches. My position is that this is unscriptural. Why? because my further position is that each church is to all intents and purposes a kingdom, a mustard seed that takes root and grows, a principality if you please, like each lamp of the golden candlestick was a separate light. Where Jesus honors by his presence the receiving, hearing and obeying of his sayings and commands—is even the head quarters of his kingdom. Where is that? Let him say. Read Matt. 18: 19, 20. This body which he promises to be with whether large or small when assembled in his name is his kingdom which if you are baptized into you are a member in full fellowship of both. In this view I am sustained by Bros. Floyd and Pres. R. Milligan. See HERALD of Dec. 7, 1883. That is as to one set of conditions.

Of your supposed case; let me suppose one. Suppose you were out in a place destitute of food, and to save your life you eat snails during the emergency, would you make the snail diet binding on your family and friends continually when you got home?

3. My position is Bible things by Bible names as much as possible. The terms church and congregation sounded like babel to me. Since I got into danger however I have learned why both are used. I did not know of the book Living Oracles, which some likely prefer. I am satisfied on that point, yet

claims that James' translation is a Bible. I also think for uniformity the term church has the preference being by long use almost consecrated to the one idea, body of Jesus Christ; while congregation is variously used.

4. My position is that teachers in Israel may possibly die in debt. Why? because when babes ask for bread the truth sometimes, the teacher throws a stone, keeping the bread which he owes.

Bro. W., I asked you for information—What was piped? If I was right, you neither say yes or no, but express astonishment. You say I find "fault." I think it is on Scriptural grounds in all candor. But have not the children a right to cry, nay even to find fault when big folks tramp on their toes? You have a class of "grumblers and fault-finders not in demand." Those having such physical infirmity as makes them weak and they presume the strong sometimes err and speak of it. I suppose Jesus was unpopular for the same reason. Read Rom. 15: 1; 14: 1-13; 2 Cor. 11: 29.

Once more and I have done. Like you, my brother, I say in "all kindness," had it not been for the false impression your teaching would make on the minds of some, and my desire to learn and improve, I should never have noticed your error. And now defend your language or explain it like a man. Please pardon me, and remember Solomon says something like this: "Rebuke a wise man and he will thank thee." I will take a lesson on beams and motes if you will read the 23rd chapter of Matthew to the 13th verse, or all of the chapter if you wish. May God help us to dwell in the unity of the spirit and in love.

Yours for the truth,

G. W. POWELL.

Stayton, Or., Jan. 21, 1884.

Evolution.

An eminent writer thus speaks of the advocates of evolution who have been making such a stir during the last few years, after the follow fashion:—

It is amusing, perhaps more so than folly ought to be, to see an ignominious stand up and prate over evolution. It does not disturb him to be reminded that nature seems to have gone out of the business of evolution. That is nothing. He can trace anything backward, the horse to the time when he was five-

toed, and the five-toed back to when he was web-footed, and the web-foot back to fins. But it is a sad thought that all upward progress had ceased. Evolution has ceased to evolve. Engravings of wheat and cattle and men found on the pyramids prove to us that none of these have changed. Four thousand years have gone by, and the first specimen of a better man does not appear. There is no sixth sense, or third eye, or winged shoulders, or telescopic eye—nothing to show that we are links in the progression upwards.

Nature has no longer a laboratory or pattern shop, in which she is evolving better forms of anything. There is no such thing as a plant or a grain or a tree leaving off some of its habits and taking on new ones, so as to become a different order of things. Strawberries are not approaching the size of watermelons. The fox, unmolested by traps and chains, is free to develop into something better, but he does not incline.

The fact is, that which was built a ferry boat remains a ferry boat, and what was built *Great Eastern* will always be *Great Eastern*; and it is just as true that elephants never lose their trunks, nor essay to carry more than one; the wild horse never affects a horn, nor do wild cattle abandon the fashion of two. The schools of mackerel never graduate whales. Catastrophies have occurred in which the liver of thousands of species have suddenly been arrested, and the bodies of many have been preserved in stone. The surprise never yet overtook a creature that was on its way up higher into a new and unknown species, nor do existing forms give any signs that they tend to invent new and untried organs. Neither is there any such thing conceivable that we can trace backward through the successive links of the progress of a species, without coming, at last, to the first link, which had no predecessor, and which could not have created itself. The whole system of evolution is without facts or even analogies so support it. Its wisest supporters are cautious not to make assertions. They say, May it not be so? It is reasonable to suppose, etc. All true science is based on facts; evolution is not so based, and it has no claims to be a science.—*Sel.*

R. J. Burdett is 40 years old, Bret Harte is 45, Mark Twain is 48, W. D. Howells is 46, Thomas Bailey Aldrich is 45, Joaquin Miller is 42, James Russell Lowell is 64, and John G. Saxe is 68.