

doubts expressed on the subject were published in the thirteenth century after Christ, yet they received hardly any attention till in the sixteenth century, when Thomas Hobbes essayed his criticism. But the book had then existed and been accepted as genuine for over three thousand years, and it was rather late to adduce so-called proofs to the contrary. The fact is that Josephus in the first century of our era contended that the book is genuine and appealed to public records then extant as corroborating the fact. Porphyry, an infidel of the third century, admits the same thing; and Julian, the apostate, was willing to admit that inspired men, among whom he counted Moses, lived among the Jews in their early existence. Mohammed also accepted the Jewish law as divine and Moses as the inspired author of the Pentateuch. Against the overwhelming testimony of ancient history and tradition, it would seem to be unreasonable in the highest degree to doubt and deny.

The evidence furnished by the book itself as to the authorship may be summarized briefly as follows: The language used and the sentiments expressed prove that the author must have been a Hebrew possessing the highest education. No unlearned Israelite and no foreigner could have composed the remarkable volume. It must also have been written by a Hebrew well acquainted with the geography, customs, sciences, etc., of Egypt and Arabia, for all the descriptions given are minutely accurate and prove it is no work of fiction. The learning of Egypt, however, was carefully guarded by the priests, and none but priests and royal persons, who were considered sacred, had access to it. The author must therefore have belonged to this privileged class. The correspondence in style between the history and the legal enactments of the book is so similar, that both must have had the same author. If Moses was the law-giver, he was also the historian. No other conclusion is reasonable or even conceivable. Further, the style of the five books bears unmistakable evidence that the author must have composed his writings under such circumstances as Moses really experienced. The first book is remarkable for brevity and simplicity of style, being an introduction to the following and probably compiled from various existing documents. In the following three books, treating on the remarkable history of Israel from the exodus, the style is abrupt, broken and full of repetitions, suggesting that the author wrote as time and circumstances would permit during the wanderings in the wilderness. The last book is continuous and didactic, often reviewing and further explaining what had previously been hastily noted down. All these points ought to be conclusive proof that no other than the great law-giver himself wrote the books that bear his name, with the exception of a very small part, relating to his death, which of course was added afterwards and most likely by Joshua, his great successor.

Those who maintain that the books of Moses are not his work but a forgery, must necessarily show, at least approximately, when this stupendous supposed literary fraud was committed.

If they cannot do this, all their arguments are entirely vain. Judaism is still extant and is admittedly founded on these very books. Can that system be founded on a forgery? If so, when? Not in the Christian era, for Judaism, according to history, precedes Christianity. Not before our era, for a forgery of that nature would easily have been detected.

One class of evidence is particularly instructive. In the Pentateuch we are told of many customs of the ancient Egyptians. Using bricks as building materials is mentioned, as are also the habits of keeping donkeys, employing eunuchs and drinking wine. At one time skeptics used to say that all these customs are Asiatic and not Egyptian, and that the mention of them proves that the author was unacquainted with life in ancient Egypt. The fact that it is stated that Joseph shaved himself before he entered the presence of Pharaoh was pointed out as a glaring error, since, it was contended, the Egyptians did not shave. Archaeology has, however, come to the rescue and conclusively proved the correctness of Moses in every particular. Excavations in Egypt have brought to light many monuments with pictures and engravings which show that brick-making was a known art, that wine was made in ancient times, although Herodotus says it was not as far as he knew, and that all Egyptians, except slaves and great kings, used to shave their beards off, unlike the Assyrians. Since these remarkable discoveries were made, skeptics have been more careful in their denials of the truth of sacred history, for it has become clear enough that science is no assistant to skepticism.

It may be observed that this kind of objection to the Pentateuch has been applied with apparent force to the Book of Mormon. Skeptics say that some of the implements and metals and animals mentioned in that sacred record never existed in ancient America. The argument will, of course, have force with those who perchance suppose that scientists know everything there is to know about ancient America. But who can really entertain so absurd an idea? Where archaeology does not happen to corroborate the Book of Mormon, it is safer to suppose that that science has yet some discoveries to make on our continent. As far as general scientific evidences go, they all corroborate the Book of Mormon. And when so much time and diligent research have been spent on this continent as have already been applied to the antiquities of Egypt and the orient, the results will undoubtedly be found to be similar.

To doubt, therefore, the genuineness or authenticity of either of the sacred records is to risk one's reputation, not only as a believer in the divine truth but also as a true scholar. Skepticism in this case seems to be both heresy and fanaticism.

IS THE TRUTH BUT A SQUIBBLE.

A local cotemporary whose desire to shorten the terms of office of the Governor and Secretary of this Territory can be easily understood, but whose deliberate misquoting of the record so far as the commissions of

those officials are concerned, still needs explanation, refers somewhat petulantly in this morning's issue to the News as "an over-captious and apparently ill-informed cotemporary," and as "our punctilious evening cotemporary." In one of these references to the subject the *Herald*—for that is the paper with whom the controversy has arisen—apologizes to "the public for devoting so much space to so trifling a quibble;" and in another paragraph it says: "It remains for us to say that owing to the business methods of the postmaster, the Secretary's misadventure [which the News quoted yesterday] did not reach the editor until yesterday." [Friday, December 9].

It now becomes the duty of the News to come to the defense of the "postmaster's methods," since it appears that through us have his methods been called in question. We can do so in no more effective manner than by quoting the following documents, obtained this morning from the Secretary's office:

The statement made in the *Herald* of the 10th inst., editorially, that the letter from me, referring to the date of the commissions of the Governor and Secretary, was mailed, is a misstatement of the fact. The letter was sent by Mr. Joseph Burton, a faithful messenger, who reported that he delivered it to the office of the *Herald* within a few minutes after I gave it to him.

ELIJAH SELLS.

I hereby certify that I promptly delivered a letter addressed to the Editor of the *Herald*, from Secretary Sells, at the *Herald* office on Thursday, Dec. 8th, 1892.

JOSEPH BURTON.

We expect that this presentment will lay us still more liable to the charge of "punctiliousness" and "over-captiousness." If such shall be the penalty for insisting on the truth, we must prepare to bear it. But since neither the "postmaster" nor his "methods" had ought to do with the delay in the arrival of the Secretary's letter of Thursday at the desk of the *Herald* editor, we hope the latter's "apologizes to the public for devoting so much space to so trifling a quibble" will not be accepted until he first apologizes to the postmaster. In his estimation an absolute conviction of misstatement of fact, and the resort to a paltry evasion to cover it, may be a "trifling quibble;" but that is his affair, not ours.

The original controversy grew out of the *Herald's* changing the date of expiration of the Governor's and Secretary's term from December 30th, 1893, as given to the reporter at the Secretary's office, to May, 1893, when four years will have elapsed since those officials entered upon the discharge of their respective duties. The fact would have excited no particular notice had not the terms of other incumbents of Federal offices been published without amendment in that paper's editorial rooms. Only in the case of the first two in the list, the Governor and Secretary, did the journalistic memory declare itself in opposition to the record; the remainder of the list went unchanged. What the motive was for thus showing partiality in the matter of attention to Governor Thomas and Secretary Sells it is not worth while to inquire. But in order that the public, who must by this time be somewhat confused in the