

conquest of Mexico and Peru, because he made use of various other books and documents for his great work.

The argument based on the names for God does not prove all that is claimed for it. It assumes that the two names refer to the same person in the Godhead and hence concludes that we have the compositions of two different authors. But if it should be proven that Elohim stands for one Divine person and Jehovah for another, the whole argument becomes invalid.

Those who deny the authorship of Moses feel the necessity of naming someone as the probable author. And Ezra is supposed to have written a great part of the Pentateuch, "the priestly code," and perhaps to have edited all of it, and then published it as the work of Moses in order to secure for it acceptance.

Who was Ezra? According to history he was a lineal descendant of Aaron, born, probably, in Babylon during the captivity. He was one of the most learned Jews of his age, and his chief characteristics were humility and fervent zeal for the glory of God. He was eminent for his researches in law and for his sense of honor, and has always been regarded as inferior only to Moses. This is the answer of history. Certain modern critics add that he was also a literary forger, a cheat, a fraud. Can anybody believe that?

But even if Ezra should have conceived the idea of framing a "priestly code" and forging a great name to it, he could not have done it. At that time a great many of the Elders of Israel were living who had seen the old Temple and participated in the services. The ancient law had been read to them periodically and its provisions were well imprinted on their minds. They had taught them to their children and related the circumstances under which they were given. Anything now that Ezra might have been disposed to engrave upon this code would at once have been detected.

Those who would like to have a practical illustration of the force of this argument might try the experiment of publishing a new edition of the Constitution of the United States and "edit" it according to their own notions. How long would it take before their fraud would be exposed?

Then, Ezra had no object to gain by forging the name of Israel's great lawgiver. When he arrived in Jerusalem the Temple, it seems, was all finished and priests and Levites ordained to the service (Ezra ix, 1.) His great work was not therefore of a ritualistic but of a moral character. He found on his arrival that a great number of the people, including the priests, had violated the law of Moses by intermarrying with the Canaanites and a reformation was therefore commenced in which he took a leading part. He did not need for this work any new ritual. The question was not of a separation from the Jewish church and the adoption of new rites but of cleansing and purifying the existing church through the enforcement of the moral code already adopted. For this reason Ezra did not need to figure as a literary forger.

That the Jews after seventy years' sojourn in Babylon should have

adopted many eastern myths and legends and incorporated them in the sacred records is a supposition altogether too improbable. Look at the Jews of today. They have now for centuries wandered as strangers on the face of the earth without country, without a sanctuary and Temple service. But how many Christian "myths and legends" have they adopted in their sacred books, or beliefs or modes of thinking? Let the modern critics answer.

Considering the internal evidence of the Pentateuch, it is plain that it was written by one whose every sentiment and sympathy were those of a Jew, and by one, moreover, who was well versed in Egyptian learning and knew the country of Arabia and its people. But Herodotus assures us that Egyptian learning was hidden from all but the priests and members of the royal family, and particularly from strangers. If this is so, where should a Jew obtain Egyptian education? The mystery is solved in the history of Moses and in nobody else within the whole range of antiquity. External evidence is also for Moses as the author. In fact, all the evidence there is goes in favor of the accepted view, while the criticism that calls itself "higher" is content to deny the evidence and substitute for it a "hazardous guess."

THE RIGHTS OF LABOR.

The news columns of this paper recently contained an account of an important decision by the supreme court of Minnesota on a feature of the boycott question which does not appear to have been judicially passed upon before. The question is thus stated: The Northwestern Lumbermen's association has a rule providing that no member shall sell goods at any prices lower than retail dealers. The Bohn Manufacturing company, one of its members, was accused of violating the rule and was notified by the secretary of the association that a circular warning of the fact would be sent to all members. The Bohn company thereupon sued out an injunction against the secretary on the ground that such a boycott would seriously injure its business, but the supreme court has dissolved the injunction and permitted the issuance of the circular, holding in effect that any member of such or any association must act in conformity with its rules. It holds further that any one unless under contract obligation or unless his employment charges him with some public duty, has a right to refuse to work for or deal with any man or class of men he sees fit, and this right any number of men may exercise jointly. This is the age of associations and labor unions; confined to their proper limits they are not only lawful but laudable; carried beyond these limits they are liable to become dangerous agencies for wrong and oppression, as they have been undoubtedly in a great many cases that have come under our observation.

On the ruling the San Francisco *Chronicle* comments as follows:

It is to be noted that in this case the circular of warning was to be sent only to the members of the association, which is obviously a different matter from the usual boycott, where an attempt is made to keep everybody from dealing with the boycotted firm or person. Had the Northwestern Lumbermen's association published a general letter, warning everybody against dealing with the Bohn company, it is probable that the supreme court of Minnesota would have allowed the injunction to stand, but this circular was somewhat in the nature of a privileged and confidential communication.

As the court well says, there are so many problems connected with labor questions and with labor associations, as well as with associations of capital, that the courts will be kept busy in solving them. No general rule can be laid down except this, that the courts should strive to administer exact justice and to reconcile individual rights and associated rights as nearly as possible in all cases.

The spirit of fairness toward labor and its organizations exhibited by the court is no less commendable than the suggestion given out that they confine themselves to proper limits, all of which can be cheerfully subscribed to.

THE BRITISH BEAR-GARDEN.

That was a rare and radiant scene in the British house of commons on Thursday evening. It has been the custom to point to the popular branch of our own national legislature as the complete realization of the ideal bear garden when the members feel well, but never in their best or their worst mood either did they come anywhere near the degree of indecency, rowdiness and low-lived rioting that characterized the doings of the British solons on the occasion spoken of. We seriously question if its equal ever occurred anywhere in a civilized and enlightened nation.

Some of the members became fairly frantic in their efforts to emulate the examples of Billingsgate and the fish-women, while others more demonstrative gave full play to their native-born prize-fighting instincts; and above it all was a pandemonium of yells, shouts and even curses that must have been as terrifying to nervous people as sickening to well-bred ones. Amid the storm was one sorrow-stricken, regretful, apprehensive, silent man. With his head bowed down in very anguish and his face blanched with a keen realization of the debasing proceedings at the Grand Old Man, himself fresh from a joust in the arena with mailed knights on the other side and in which there were bitterness, incisiveness, and power but not a trace of such unmanliness as that that was going on. The men upon whom he relied to assist him in placing the capstone upon his ambitious life-work fighting, snarling, howling and screeching like so many distempered dogs! It was shameful—scandalous.

Nelson A. Fairchild died on Monday at Gila Bend, Ariz., of sunstroke. This breaks Arizona's boast of no sunstrokes, as it is the first on record.