

guitar, which he did. Then, when they got ready to go, they took a young man who was working for uncle, and told the rest to stay in the house, which we all did. They next took the young man to a house where they thought they could get some whisky. They ordered him to call up the man, which he did. The man came to the door in his night clothes, and they told him to come out. He said he would as soon as he got his pants on. He had no sooner turned than they commenced to shoot. They shot the man in the left arm and his wife in the right arm, tearing the whole of her elbow off. They next shot a young girl while she lay in bed. They struck her three times, once in the leg, once in the hip, and out the flesh in the small of the back. They then told the young man to get a saddle which was lying near. He got the saddle—and put it on top of another which was already on the back of a horse. Next they made him dance by shooting at his feet. Then they got on their horses and rode away. The next day I went over to the house. It was a fearful sight—blood over everything. The marshals have been after them ever since; there are four here now, eating dinner.

Everybody seems to obey orders promptly down there on occasions of this kind; and doubtless everybody who loves peace and good order will be grateful when the day comes that the law can be so vigorously enforced that white renegades such as form the Cook gang and other combinations of outlaws in Indian Territory will find it impossible to engage in such terrorizing proceedings with impunity. Meanwhile there will be no sympathy wasted upon the receipt of news from time to time that one or another of the desperadoes has fallen in a quarrel with his companions or through the well-directed aim of the officers.

FOR "HIGHER CRITICS."

Prof. E. J. Wolf, of the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in a recent article in the *Independent* draws a parallel that is calculated to throw light on the controversy raised by the modern advocates of the so-called "higher criticism" of the Bible.

One of the most important state papers to which President Cleveland has set his signature is his message to Congress on the Hawaiian affair. One would naturally suppose that a composition of that nature, written as it were but yesterday, could not give rise to different opinions as to the authorship, among critics well acquainted with the strong peculiarities of the distinguished gentleman whose name it bears, and competent, one would think, to judge of such matters. The fact is all the more remarkable that widely different opinions on this subject do exist and have been freely published.

Hon. Edward McPherson in the *Gettysburg Star and Sentinel* says: "As a matter of style it is a great improvement on any other of Mr. Cleveland's messages, having evidently been prepared by Mr. Gresham." Mr. Dana, of the *New York Sun*, takes another view and states bluntly: "Five-sixths of the message is a restatement in Mr. Cleveland's own language of the argument for the policy of it fame." Mr. McPherson has for more than thirty years

been closely affiliated with the political leaders of the country, well conversant with their characteristics of style in speech and writing. And Mr. Dana's qualifications as a judge of the authorship of an official document will not be questioned. How, then, is the fact accounted for that one of these able critics sees in the Hawaiian message the "improved" style of Secretary Gresham, while to the other it is almost entirely the President's own language?

With this contradiction of each other by expert critics, in the case of a modern document, the "higher critics" of the Bible will find it a difficult task to reconcile their claim that they can easily pick out what paragraphs authors thousands of years ago wrote and spoke. They tell us that Moses wrote this and some editor of Mosais writings that; they claim to be able to recognize the poetical compositions of David as distinct from those of Ezra, and assert that Isaiah could not have written certain portions of the book that bears his name. And so positive are they that they refuse to recognize as a scholar anybody who dares to question the solidity of their arguments. When it is demonstrated, however, as in the case of the President's letter to Congress, that mistakes as to the authorship are possible, when the question seems to be an exceedingly simple one, how much reliability is to be placed on the statements of critics who undertake to decide a problem, the correct solution of which depends on a number of facts, many of which are no longer to be ascertained by the ordinary methods of investigation? Evidently, "higher criticism," whatever its value may be, is not entitled to the infallibility that some of its advocates claim for it.

As a matter of fact, doubts as to the authorship of the Mosais writings were not expressed by any now known writer before the thirteenth century after Christ and some of the early adherents of the theory of denial, Thomas Hobbes, for instance, can not be considered competent judges. The best scholarship of every age has declared for the genuineness of the books in dispute.

One of the main arguments against Isaiah, and also of Daniel, rests chiefly on the assertion that certain portions of their books are too plain in the description of events supposed at that time to be future. They are written after those events, it is claimed, and not before. They are history and not prophecy. To a desire to establish this proposition may be traced the efforts of finding differences of style, etc. It is, in other words, a plain attempt to deny the prophetic gift as such, when in the judgment of the critics the prophetic language is "too plain," that is, giving undeniable evidence of the Divine inspiration of the Seers. No unessence, however, need be felt on this point. Prophetic writings have vindicated themselves all through the ages, as history has confirmed the predictions made, and even in our own age, numerous events transpire, clearly foretold both by Isaiah and Daniel. Others are on the verge of fulfilment, and when the closing chapter of this dispensation shall have been written, it will be found that the an-

cient servants of the Lord, as those in this modern age, were led by the Spirit that has from the beginning superintended the affairs of nations. This fact will be more and more apparent as the winding-up scenes approach, and in the meantime a criticism that depends mostly on prejudice toward the supernatural element in the scriptures will probably assume a more rational attitude than it has at present.

THE GATHERING OF STATISTICS.

One of the deputy statisticians for Salt Lake county has pointed out to us that people are seemingly very averse to giving the information which the statistical schedules require, and do not realize that the law makes the furnishing of such information compulsory. At the same time some people have complained that the statisticians inquire too closely into private affairs; the complainants also assert that if the law goes so far as to claim for it, then it is an unwarrantable invasion of the personal rights and liberty of the citizen, and its enforcement is improper; therefore they ask for information regarding it.

With reference to the first request we will say that the law directs that statisticians be appointed for a stated purpose, and also requires the people to give them certain information which it is considered will be of public benefit. It is provided that a refusal to conform to this requirement shall subject the person refusing to the penalty of a fine not less than five dollars nor more than two hundred dollars. The deputy statisticians in each county must begin their work not later than the first of February in each statistical year (that is, 1895, and triennially thereafter), and a failure to perform their duty renders them liable to fine and imprisonment.

The information which the law requires that persons apply to shall furnish to the deputy statisticians is, as to the number of acres they have of improved land, unimproved land, and land under cultivation during 1894 as farms; acres irrigated, and also under enclosure for pasture; acres of crops and amount and value thereof; acres of apple, peach, apricot, pear and plum trees; the number of bushels of each fruit sold; the number of bushels and value of small fruit produced, including currants, cherries and berries; the number of pounds and value of grapes sold; the number of gallons of wine, cider, vinegar and sorghum; number of pounds of butter, cheese, honey, and of each kind of dried fruit; number of hives of bees, and pounds of wool shorn; and the number of milch cows, cattle, horses, mules, asses, sheep, goats, and swine over six months old, owned on the 31st day of December of the preceding year.

In addition to procuring the data mentioned in the foregoing enumeration, the deputy statisticians are required to collect information as to the amount that has been expended for public and private buildings, and on public works; the number of industrial concerns and people employed, wages paid, value of plants, amount and value of annual product and capital, number of stores, with their capital;