

Turkey can be easily compensated, possibly by the Jews assuming an equitable portion of the national debt."

The petition concludes with the eloquent statement that this is the appropriate time for the Christian nations to show kindness to Israel. "A million of exiles," it submits, "by their terrible sufferings, are piteously appealing to our sympathy justice and humanity. Let us now restore them to the land of which they were so cruelly despoiled by our Roman ancestors."

This proposition to restore these wanderers to their native homes contains not only justice for the Jews but for other nations. Almost without doubt it is to America, that these two million, with all the marks of centuries of oppression on them would come. Trained to distrust their rulers, they would, almost against their will, retain in America the attitude of mind which they have in Russia, and would also increase the frightful labor congestion which already begins to torment this country. But conscious of creating their own autonomy, as they would be if they returned to Palestine, and of being again a free nation with a free country to call their own, that marvelous aptitude for industry, for art and for law-making might make them once more an important factor among the nations of the world.

Mr. Blackstone's idea is almost identical with the plan which George Eliot put in the mouth of her character, Daniel Deronda, and it appeals not only to our natural sense of justice but to our good judgment.—*Omaha World-Herald*.

THE OLDEST WILL.

The discovery of the earliest known will is an event which possesses an interest for others besides lawyers, and there seems no reason to question either the authenticity or antiquity of the unique document which Mr. Flinders Petrie has unearthed at Kahun or, as the town was known 4500 years ago, Illahu. The document is so curiously modern in form that it might almost be granted probate today. But, in any case, it may be assumed that it marks one of the earliest epochs of legal history, and curiously illustrates the continuity of legal methods. It is, however, needless to label the value, socially, legally and historically of a will that dates back to patriarchal times.

It consists of a settlement made by one Sekhenren in the year 44, second month of Pert, day 19, that is, it is estimated, the 44th of Amenemhat III, 2550 B. C.—in favor of his brother, a priest of Osiris, of all his property and goods; and of another document, which bears date from the time of Amenemhat IV, or 2548 B. C. This latter instrument is, in form, nothing more nor less than a will, by which, in phraseology that might well be used today, the testator settles upon his wife, Teta, all the property given him by his brother for life, but forbids in categorical terms to pull down the houses "which my brother built for me," although it empowers her to give them to any of her children that she pleases. A "lieutenant," Siou, is to act as guardian of the infant children.

This remarkable instrument is witnessed by two scribes, with an attes-

tation clause that might have been drafted yesterday. The papyrus is a valuable contribution to the study of ancient law, and shows with a graphic realism what a pitch of civilization the ancient Egyptian had reached at least from a lawyer's point of view. It has hitherto been believed that in the infancy of the human race wills were practically unknown. There probably never was a time when testaments in some form or other did not exist; but, in the earliest ages it has so far been assumed they were never written, but were nuncupatory, or delivered orally, probably at the deathbed of the testator.

Among the Hindus to this day the law of succession hinges upon the due solemnization of fixed ceremonies at the dead man's funeral, not upon any written will. And it is because early wills were verbal only that their history is so obscure. It has been asserted that among the barbarian races the bare conception of a will was unknown; that we must search for the infancy of testamentary dispositions in the early Roman law. Indeed, until the ecclesiastical power assumed the prerogative of intervening at every break in the succession of the family, wills did not come into vogue in the west. But Mr. Petrie's papyrus seems to show that the system of settlement or disposition by deed or will was long antecedently practiced in the east.—*Ex.*

A STORMY SCENE.

The recent exciting scenes in Congress remind the knowing ones of an incident of a stormy character occurring in a secret session of the Senate of the Confederate States, when there was a violent rupture between two famous Southern men whose names now belong to our common history—Ben Hill of Georgia and William L. Yancey of Alabama. Both men are now in their graves, and, so far as I know, neither one ever saw in print any reference to the episode which came so near ending in the immediate death of Yancey, and which still has the touch of fatality about it. Mutual friends at the time made every effort to keep the full facts from the newsmongers of the day, and the story has doubtless been forgotten by nearly all all who ever did hear anything about the difficulty and its ending. In the forthcoming "Life of Mr. Yancey"—one of the series of biographies of illustrious Americans—doubtless the details will be given, as it is known that, before his death the distinguished Alabamian gave a friend of his all the particulars, with the request that he see that justice was done to both the senators. A word of reference here may not be uninteresting to your readers.

Both of the eminent Southerners were of fiery and impassioned natures. Yancey was doubtless the gentler and more brilliant of the two, although his attainments were not so popular nor so varied as those of Senator Hill, who was, in fact, one of the greatest men the South has produced in the more modern era. Yancey was a finer scholar, was less excitable, and was more winning in his manner. Indeed, personally, William L. Yancey was one of the purest and noblest characters

the nation has ever produced, and he has been misjudged by all who did not know him intimately, and especially by people of the North. Yancey was to the South what Wendell Phillips was to the North—a man of transcendent intellect, of violent hates, yet of a generous, kindly nature, with a heart overflowing with love and goodness. And yet Phillips was not in love with a Union that upheld slavery; nor was Yancey in love with a Union which was to be controlled by fanatics who were willing to override the Constitution in their hates.

Yancey was not an original secessionist; that fact must be remembered in his favor. He violently opposed nullification, and only became a follower and advocate of secession when he, like thousands of other patriots, believed that nothing but a cutting loose from the abolitionists of the North could bring justice to the South.

Like Phillips, Yancey was an orator of the highest type. In the purity of his passion there was an absolute intolerance of what he conceived to be wrong. He despised the duplicity of the mere politician; he abhorred everything that had even the semblance of trickery or knavery in politics, and he died with clean hands and a pure heart, if he was a secessionist, at the last.

It was Yancey's lofty character, and his utter detestation of what he conceived to be the impure, in either public or private life, which involved him in the difficulty with Senator Hill. He impuned the motives of the Georgian, at the time I have referred to, in secret session of the Confederate senate. Hill, whose sense of honor was the very highest, instantly resented the imputation, and by way of adding emphasis to his indignation in the enforcement of his resentment, he hurled a heavy desk inkstand at the Alabamian. The blow was aimed with such precision and force that, striking Yancey in the region of the temple, it floored him, and came, as I have intimated, well nigh proving fatal on the spot. Friends interfered and that was the end of the trouble there. Yancey told subsequently that the wound was accidentally inflicted by a boy on the street.

The great Alabamian never fully recovered from the effects of the blow. Just before he died he told a confidential friend of the particulars, and it was believed at the time that his death was indeed hastened by the unfortunate occurrence.—*Atlanta Constitution*.

DEATH OF JOHN D. PARKER.

By letter from Brother A. B. Griffin, of Kanarra, we learn of the death, at his residence in that place, on the 26th ult., of John D. Parker, who expired after suffering two weeks from la grippe. Deceased was born in Saratoga, New York, Nov. 22nd, 1798. He served when a youth in the war of 1812. He embraced the Gospel in 1834, was one of the Camp of Zion and a true and trusted friend of the Prophet Joseph Smith. He was the father of 14 children, five of whom are living—one son and four daughters. He also leaves two wives and 17 grandchildren. He obeyed every law of the new and everlasting covenant and has gone to reap the rewards of his labors.