

done whenever it has been observed. For the sake of your Homer, the 90,000 Sunday school children and the millions coming after you, leave no less legacy to all these than freedom from the curse of a saloon.

Yours, ever for the right,
W. O. CLARK.

SCIENCE AND BIBLE STATEMENTS.

On this subject Prof. J. B. Thomas, in the *Homiletic Review* makes the following observations:

If it were ever desirable or possible to deny the use by Scripture writers of language which is embarrassingly difficult to accept if taken literally, it is certainly no longer so since the lavishly erudite massing of testimony to that effect by President A. D. White, in his articles on the "Warfare of Science." It is soberly true, as he affirms, that the heavens are spoken of by them as having "windows," both the earth and the heavens as having "pillars," the sun as "rising" and "going down," etc. He might have added that the sea is affirmed to have "doors," the waters to contain "chambers," laid upon "beams," the clouds to be made into "chariots," and the wind to have "wings." But if the abandonment of metaphor is the essential condition of "inerrancy" in referring to the facts of nature, it is doubtful if any modern writer can pretend to scientific veracity. Mr. Darwin certainly could not; for his world-famous phrase—"natural selection," "struggle for life," floral "con-trivance," the "law of parsimony," and the like, forbid. Grant Allen, in his choice little "Story of the Plants," just issued, categorically declares that they "learn by the teaching of natural selection" what kind of leaves it is most desirable to produce; that they "take care to throw away no valuable material;" that the trees providently "arrange for the fall of their leaves," in the most wholesome way, etc. He would, no doubt, be surprised to hear that he had therefore been cited as engaged in "warfare" against science; his language plainly reiterating the old Dryadic superstition of the Greeks. Writing in the nineteenth century, when words have immensely multiplied and shaded themselves to exactitude of use, he finds himself compelled, in describing phenomena, to speak phenomenally.

This is, in fact, the universally and unchallenged fashion of science. Men talk glibly of straight lines, atoms, ether, as if these were producible to the eye, solid to the scalpel, and imperishably actual. But none know better than themselves that not one of them is demonstrable, even if it be intelligibly possible. Shall we become more exacting of language in its crude archaic poverty, than in its rich development and elaborate refinement of phrase? The word "day," for instance, still has a penumbra of meaning beyond its more specific reference to the time of the earth's revolution on its axis. Is it reasonable to suppose that, when "fingers were used for forks," it was less comprehensive in use?

It may be added that the objection to Scripture statements on the ground that its terms are scientifically incorrect is all the more absurd, as the objection applies chiefly to the terms selected by translators as an equivalent for the word in the original. Whatever the error of expression may be is to be charged to translators and not to the first writers. Objects are by them designated by certain qualities as generally observed, and they can therefore correctly speak of the "heavens" as an

"expanse" for instance, and of "openings," or "apertures," through which the rain finds its way to the earth. The modern idea of "window" and the old notion of "firmament" are both foreign to the original. They can with as much truth and poetic beauty speak of the "rising sun" as we can in our day watch the "sun-rise" and "sun-set." Their mode of expression is no proof that they were ignorant of the structure of the universe. There are, on the contrary, numerous expressions to prove they were not. Biblical authors speak of the earth as a sphere, "dependent on nothing;" they distinguish between unorganized matter and the creation of the heavens and the earth; they speak of the stars as immovable and intimate their connection in vast systems all dependent on some all-pervading power. In nearly every field science is to some extent anticipated by the writers of the Bible, a fact which would be plainer still, were it possible to give one in every respect perfect translation of the terms they use. There is no conflict between the Bible and true science. The present need of reconciliation has grown out of a misunderstanding of the Scriptures and the dicta of a philosophy that does not merit that name.

QUORUM REUNION.

A reunion of the Thirtieth quorum of Seventy was held at the residence of one of the Seven Presidents of that quorum, on the evening of the 15th inst. Elder Andrew Kimball opened up his house and the meeting was held in accord with a custom of that quorum, which has been followed for the past fifty years. On this occasion some of its old members and two of the first council of Seventy and President Joseph F. Smith, were present in the festive company, which were so kindly entertained by the host and hostess. Everything for the pleasure and evening's enjoyment was found under the hospitable roof, including music and singing. Short addresses were delivered by President J. F. Smith, J. G. Kimball, E. Stevenson, Sister E. J. Stevenson and all seven of the presidents as they now stand in order. The refreshments and a general social interchange were freely enjoyed. All present felt cheered by the presence of so many of the quorum and their families and friends. Such reunion of the various quorums of Seventy are both interesting and profitable.

A short review of this Thirtieth quorum may prove interesting. It was organized in the city of Nauvoo, on the seventh day of September, 1845, with Caleb Savage as its senior president, who was cut off from the Church on February 8, 1846, for apostasy. He became one of the leading Strangites. Elder Joseph Cain was ordained to fill the vacancy. He died a faithful and useful officer in 1857. His vacancy was filled by the ordination of Elder Edward Stevenson in June, 1857, who became senior president until October 1, 1894, when he was called to fill a vacancy in the first council of the Seventy. Dr. Wm. A. Sanger was the next or second president, who was cut off for apostasy about the same time as was the senior or first presi-

dent, for the same cause. He also became one of the leaders of the Strangite church. So also was the fate of the fourth president, Hiram Stratton, who joined the Strangites. It is said also that J. J. Strang, the leader of the Strangites, was cut off from the Church and the Thirtieth quorum. John W. Cooley, the third president, and Thomas McKinze, the fifth, as well as Arler C. Brower, the sixth, and Samuel H. Rogers, the seventh president, all kept faithful members and true to their calling in the Thirtieth quorum of Seventy.

If the Thirtieth quorum of Seventies has furnished the leaders of the Strangite church, it has also furnished as one of its honored presidents, Elder George Q. Cannon, as one of the First Presidency of the Church.

The Thirtieth also feels pleasure of seeing one of the Twelve Apostles, H. J. Grant, as one of its honored members as well as President A. M. Cannon, of the Salt Lake Stake of Zion. So was Bishop G. H. Taylor, one of its members. Bishop Joseph Rawlins, of South Cottonwood, was once one of the Thirtieth quorum. High Councilor James P. Freeze was also one of the honored members of that distinguished quorum. Many others who may have missed our present notice have passed on to fill honored callings. Only a few years ago the presidents of the Thirtieth quorum had a picture taken and today only two of that council remains. But the quorum now stands complete and in good order as one of the 108 quorums organized.

The Seventies as witnesses for Jesus Christ are necessary officers. They belong to Christ's Church as set in order by Himself. E. STEVENSON.

SALT LAKE CITY, Jan. 17, 1896.

RAILROAD LEGISLATION.

SALT LAKE CITY,
January 18, 1896.

Referring to the proposed law before the State Assembly, and referring still more to a sentiment which seems to prevail largely in the community, and which may find expression in future propositions before the law-making body, I beg to declare the opinion that under all the circumstances anything that partakes of the character of radical anti-railway legislation ought to be avoided by the Legislature as unwholesome. Revolutionary enactments regarding rates and other matters are sure to result in evil, and the first Legislature cannot afford to reach out too far in that direction, but should "make haste slowly." Whatever legislation may be adopted will be, from the temper of those now demanding laws on the subject, more likely to increase the difficulties surrounding local officials, because of its application only in the State; whereas those officials ought to be helped and strengthened, since their sympathies are usually where they are located. Utah should profit by the experience of others; for instance, in Kansas, where anti-railroad legislation was of a radical character, the result was injurious to the railways, but was still more disastrous to the State, which will not recover therefrom for years to come.

The State cannot afford to drive away capital by ill-advised legal restrictions. In the matter of rail-