

impossible that the negro will venture a battle with the Anglo-Egyptian force before he relinquishes the rights acquired by the treaty with King Humbert.

THE HEBREW SABBATH.

The Christian Endeavor for January, this year, contains an article upon the Sabbath question, the contents of which should be widely known. In it the claim is put forth that the Jewish Sabbath during the Mosaic dispensation was not, as commonly believed, Saturday, but a changeable day, as every festival observed on a fixed date necessarily must be. This view is advocated by Rev. S. W. Gamble of the South Kansas conference of the Methodist Episcopal church. At a first glance it certainly appears absurd, but when the argument in favor of it is more closely considered, it assumes a different aspect. Should it, on thorough examination, be found to be correct, the discovery may unhesitatingly be pronounced a most important one, as settling forever the controversy between those who observe the Christian Sabbath and the clamorers for a return to the Mosaic ordinances.

Briefly stated, Rev. Gamble's argument is as follows. The Jewish ecclesiastical year commenced on the first of Nisan or Abib. But according to the law of Sabbaths (Lev. 23) the fifteenth, twenty-second and twenty-ninth of that month always were Sabbaths, and as six secular days were to intervene between each Sabbath the year round, it follows that the Sabbath day would fall in rotation on every day of the week, just as our Christmas day or the Fourth of July does.

The law concerning the Sabbath was that on that day no work should be done. But it was also by the law prescribed that on the 10th of Abib the Jewish families should arrange for the eating of the passover, select a suitable lamb, and so on. On the 14th of the same month the lamb should be killed, dressed and prepared for the Sabbath. On the 16th the first ripe grain was waved in the temple and the harvest began. But it is evident that these dates would frequently fall on Saturday, as can be demonstrated by any calendar. The conclusion is therefore seemingly unavoidable that though every seventh day always was Sabbath, every Saturday was not. Otherwise the Jews were in the peculiar position of being both commanded and forbidden to do work on some of their Sabbaths—a difficulty that does not exist if the theory is accepted that every seventh day, not every Saturday, was the weekly Sabbath.

There was another peculiarity about the Jewish Sabbath. According to Lev. 23, the people were instructed to proclaim "the morrow after the seventh Sabbath" a day of holy convocation. The seventh week therefore had two Sabbaths, making a complete cycle of fifty days. This fact throws the first day of the week, and consequently also the seventh, one day further forward than it was before the passover. The same rule obtained regarding Sabbath years. Every sev-

enth year was a year of rest, but when forty-nine years were completed the fiftieth was also a Sabbath year, or year of jubilee. The seventh week of years consisted of eight years, two of which were Sabbath years.

The conclusions are:

The weekly Sabbath of the Jews was instituted in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt on the 15th of Abib. This date was therefore always always a Sabbath and the others were counted from it.

Each week contained six secular days and one, and sometimes two, Sabbaths.

The first day of the week was the day following the single or double Sabbath.

The question remains how and when the Hebrew nation came to adopt Saturday as their weekly Sabbath. Mr. Gamble thinks if that subject were required into the custom could be traced no farther back than between the fourth and second centuries after Christ. Dr. Hirsch, a Jewish rabbi, asserts, however, that there are documents proving that the custom dates still farther back, but he also admits that originally the Sabbaths were on fixed dates instead of a certain day of the week, as we now count the days.

The subject is, to say the least, exceedingly interesting and deserves a thorough investigation.

CHANGE IT IN FUTURE.

In Friday's News there was an account of an awful murder, followed by the suicide of the murderer, in a little town in Utah county. A demented husband slaughtered his wife, who, being in bed with their twenty-four hours old infant, was too weak to prevent the murderous deed; he then turned the weapon on himself with fatal effect. By the tragedy there are nine orphaned children in the town today.

Regrettable as such an awful event is at any time, in this case it is made more so from the probability that strict official surveillance might have prevented it—at least might have preserved to those orphaned mother whose loving watchcare they are now deprived of, and averted a horrible crime. Some weeks ago the husband and father attempted self-destruction. He had made threats frequently, causing him to be feared by some as a dangerous man. He was known to be mentally unbalanced, but had lucid intervals, and the officers and many others thought him harmless.

None will say it was intentional negligence which caused this man to be left at liberty. It was rather a mistaken policy that is given too much scope in this section. Instead of being confined in jail twenty-five days for the previous attempt on his life and then turned loose upon his promise to do better, this man who had displayed insanity sufficiently serious to threaten others and to try to kill himself should have been taken by the county officers and placed in the insane asylum, where competent authority would pass upon the state of his mental faculties. The mistake was made when he was sent to jail for his former attempt on his life. The proper place was the insane

asylum, for him and for all who show similar traits. A recognition of this fact, and application of the rule fitting such cases, would have prevented this murderous deed. Let it be a sad but effective warning for all future cases.

INDIAN ANTIQUITY.

Thomas Wilson, L.L.D., discusses, in the Archaeologist department of Popular Science News, February number, the Antiquity of the Red Man. He eliminates incidental questions, and discusses only the broad proposition of the American Indian, as he was found at the time of the discovery of America, in relation to his long residence on this continent.

In starting out, Dr. Wilson announces that, whatever may have been thought by some to the contrary, it is an incontrovertible fact that the American race of Indians is practically the same throughout the entire hemisphere; that with all their diversity (which is not greater among the Indians than among the white or black races) they develop a remarkable fixedness of type. This, he insists, establishes the point that the race began in America either by evolution or by migration from another country, the latter being his preference. He further maintains that in the beginning the race was represented by few individuals—it may have been a pair, or a hundred; their fixedness of type proves there was no great diversity in the source, but is distinct evidence of being narrowed to one family. And "from the single locality which the colony originally inhabited," he says, "it extended itself territorially until we find it to have pretty fairly and equally populated the hemisphere from the Arctic circle on the north to Terra del Fuego on the south, and from the Atlantic ocean on the east to the Pacific on the west."

These two facts of increase in number and extension of territory are taken to be evidence of the early period at which the ancestors of the present race appeared in this hemisphere, and so of its antiquity. Says he: "The conclusion seems irresistible that the North American Indian has been on this hemisphere such a length of time that by the ordinary mode of procreation his numbers have increased, so that it is estimated that at the time of the discovery by Columbus there were eleven million or thereabout."

There is next discussed the rapidity with which modern nations have increased, the United States for instance; and it is shown that the different conditions existing on this hemisphere before the discovery prove that the increase in numbers was so retarded thereby that it must have taken many centuries to people the country as it was found to be in the fifteenth century. The division into tribes was a potent factor against increase in numbers, for it was productive of internecine strife.

Dr. Wilson also insists that the distribution of population, the division of languages, the difference in industry, the segregation into tribes with their condition of continual warfare, are satisfactory evidences that the