

er if it should fulfill the predictions of those who hold that it will work damage to property and inconvenience to the public, then there is no remedy. The universal experience of cities should teach them to be more than careful to draw rigidly the line of caution and err on the side of conservatism in the granting of charters which involve a surrender of public rights. It is on this ground that many who recognize the necessity of added means of cheap and rapid transit, and who are inclined to believe that the electric railway may prove a success, have nevertheless doubted if it were good policy to equip it at the outset with privileges so valuable."

Peoria, Illinois, has the same question to decide, an electric rapid transit company being engaged in endeavoring to secure franchises for certain streets. The *Journal* of that city says:

"After all that has been said in favor of rapid transit, there is no doubt but that it is a good thing, providing those who patronize and sustain it want it. If, however, it means getting possession of some valuable franchises for nothing, we do not believe it is a good thing, or that it is economy for anyone to countenance it."

A NUT FOR GOVERNOR GRAY.

THE *New York Times* gives the following hint to the Governor of Indiana, in reference to the lawless ruffians who have been spreading terror in some parts of the State, and have brutally whipped and otherwise maltreated people against whom nothing could be alleged under the law:

"It is surprising that in a state like Indiana, which is supposed to be civilized and to possess a government strong enough to protect her citizens, the career of the White Caps could have been tolerated a week, to say nothing of a year. The exploits of these ruffians are a disgrace to the state and a reflection upon the courage and ability of the executive branch of its government. The scoundrels could not pursue their brutal business more openly in a border settlement, where no law but that of force exists, than they have pursued in this populous state, that claims to be able to protect society by law. Indeed, in a border settlement the brutes would have been annihilated long ago, for they would have been met with the same weapons that they use so freely upon others—the lash and the birch. If Indiana as a state does not soon take some steps to wipe out this stain on her escutcheon, her citizens will be justified in the eyes of the world if they follow the example set by the White Caps, take the law into their own hands, and themselves exterminate a pest which the government that they support to protect them is apparently powerless to cope with."

JEPHTHAH'S VOW.

A Lucid Explanation of a Striking Passage in the Bible.

Editor *Deseret News*:

In my attempt at a criticism of Col. Ingersoll's Reply to Mr. Gladstone, I advocated, as you will remember, the view, that Jephthah did not kill his daughter but consecrated her to the service of the Lord. A friend of mine has kindly pointed out to me, that he did not think this interpretation was consistent with the Hebrew text of the passage, and that, in fact, the argument was "misleading." I therefore thought I would submit the following to your perusal. If you think the subject important enough to warrant a reconsideration in your valuable paper, I would be much pleased. To me the subject is important. It shows how a grave objection to the Bible may be solved by a careful study of the objectionable passage. It vindicates the glory and the honor of God by aiding in ascertaining the truth. And I firmly believe that the Latter-day Saints have this work, amongst others to perform, to be the successful defenders of revealed truth, against the horrible hydra of infidelity, the idol of our age.

My attention was called to this subject many years ago. While a student at Regent's Park College, London, I heard a very able discourse on "Jephthah's Vow." Since then I have examined the subject carefully, and the more I think the matter over, the more convinced I feel that Jephthah was no murderer.

OPINIONS DIVIDED.

I am fully aware that the opinions concerning Jephthah have been divided among Bible commentators. Most of the ancient fathers think that the judge really immolated his daughter. But I also know that the weight of argument is now generally considered to be, that she was not sacrificed, but consecrated. The subject is briefly discussed in a note, found at the end of the eleventh chapter of Judges, Henry and Scott's Commentary, published by the Religious Tract Society, London, 1841. I quote the following:

"Though Josephus, and many commentators after him, are of the opinion that Jephthah did really immolate his daughter, the probability is that she was not sacrificed." "Further, it is not said that he

sacrificed her, but that he did with her according to his vow. The subsequent remark of the sacred historian (she knew no man) is uncalled for, if she were sacrificed, but not if she were compelled to remain single. On the whole we may safely conclude, that Jephthah's daughter was not sacrificed, but consecrated to a state of celibacy."

Dr. Joseph Angus, a distinguished member of the Royal Asiatic Society, and a member of the committee who completed the last revision of the English Bible, in his Bible Handbook, page 350, says:

"Human sacrifices were expressly forbidden. All who even touched a dead body were unclean; and, moreover, no devoted thing could be sacrificed. Jephthah probably devoted his daughter to perpetual virginity."

Such is the testimony of the ablest Bible scholars of the present time.

INSURMOUNTABLE DIFFICULTIES.

If we suppose that Jephthah killed his daughter, we meet with the following difficulties, which I confess my utter inability to see my way clear of:

(1.) We are told, by the advocates of the killing theory, that Jephthah in an evil moment made a "rash" vow, which he did "ill to make and worse to perform." (Henry and Scott.) But the whole character of Jephthah is against this supposition. Jephthah was not only a brave, deliberating and a peaceful man, but at the time he made his vow, the Spirit of the Lord was upon him. For we read:

"The Spirit of the Lord came upon Jephthah, and he passed over Gilead, and Manassah, and passed over Mizpeh of Gilead, and from Mizpeh of Gilead he passed over to the children of Ammon. And Jephthah vowed a vow unto the Lord, etc. Judges xi: 29, 30.

The whole narrative shows that the judge acted under the direct influence and guidance of the spirit. How is it possible that under this influence he could involve himself in the necessity of killing his own child? I find no answer.

(2.) Human sacrifices were forbidden by God.

"Whoever he be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel, that giveth any of his seed to Molech, he shall surely be put to death." Lev. xx: 2. "Take heed to thyself that thou be not snared by following them (the Canaanites) for every abomination to the Lord which he hateth have they done unto their gods; for even their sons and their daughters they have burnt in the fire to their gods." Deut. xii: 29-31.

Human sacrifices are condemned and declared to be "abominable" before the Lord also in the following passages: Ps. cvi: 34-40; Jer. vii: 31; Hez. xvi: 20-21.

Jephthah must have known that human sacrifice was abominable before God. And yet, we are requested to suppose that he, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, made a vow to commit the abominable act of sacrificing his child. We are to believe that the unfortunate father bound himself to commit a crime the penalty of which was capital punishment. Lev. xx: 2.

(3.) Jephthah's vow bound him to offer a burnt offering (Olah). There are at least twenty-one different kinds of offerings mentioned in the Scriptures, but Jephthah's was a "burnt-offering." The law concerning this kind of sacrifice is very minute in Lev. i. It should consist of a male animal to be slain at the door of the tabernacle. It was to be an atonement. The blood should be sprinkled by the priests upon the altar, and the victim should be flayed and cut into pieces, and the whole burnt up, except the skin, which belonged to the priest.

"And the priest that offereth any man's burnt-offering, even the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering." Lev. vii: 8.

Must we suppose that Jephthah did according to this law with his daughter, although the law required a male animal for this kind of offering? If not, she was not slain as a burnt-offering at all, and he did not keep his vow.

(4.) Another difficulty is this: If Jephthah promised the Lord (as the common reading is) to give to Him whatever should meet him and to offer "it" up for a burnt-offering, then he promised to do, what he must have known that he could not do, since no thing that was given to the Lord could be sacrificed. A sacrifice must be offered from a man's own possessions. From the moment it was given to the Lord, it did no longer belong to the giver, and the giver could consequently no longer offer it as a sacrifice. The law is very clear on this point. What was the Lord's already, as for instance, the firstlings, could not be "sanctified" a second time. "The firstling of the beasts, which should be the Lord's firstling, no man shall sanctify it." It is the Lord's. "Lev. xxvii: 26.

(5.) In Leviticus i. 8, the command is given to the priests, Aaron's sons, that they should lay the parts of the victim in order upon the altar, when a burnt offering was to be offered. But the priests were expressly forbidden to touch a dead body. "Neither shall he go in to any dead body, nor defile himself for his father, or for his mother." Lev. xxi: 11. Whoever was defiled by touching a dead body had to go outside the camp and be unclean. Numb. v: 4. See also Lev. xxii: 4-7. Hence the utter impossibility for Jephthah to offer his daughter as a burnt offering to the Lord, even if he had been disposed to do it.

(6.) The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives Jephthah a prominent place among the ancient Saints who

through faith "wrought righteousness and obtained promises." Heb. xi: 32. And this the Holy Spirit again repeats in the Book of Doc. and Cov. Lecture i: 20.

Now, to snuff up the difficulties here pointed out; we are expected to believe that Jephthah out of gratitude to God for received blessings, killed his only child in direct violation of the sixth commandment; that he offered God a human sacrifice, although he knew that this was an abomination before the Lord; that he induced the priests of God to defile themselves and the sanctuary of God; in short, that he inspired by God's Spirit committed one of the greatest crimes a man could commit during the old dispensation, and that he, notwithstanding this, has twice by inspired writers been ranked among the greatest saints on earth, held up as an example of faith for all the world. This is what to me seems impossible.

THE DIFFICULTIES SOLVED.

Fortunately, none of these difficulties exists in reality. Those conversant with the Hebrew grammar know that Jephthah's vow, as recorded in Judges xi: 30, 31, can be rendered thus into English: "And Jephthah vowed a vow unto the Lord and said '... whatsoever comes out of the doors of my house ... shall be for the Lord, and I will offer Him (the Lord) a burnt offering.'" Dr. Randolph among others advocates this rendering of the passage. The Hebrew word "vehaleethechoo," he says, ought to be rendered:

"I will offer him a burnt offering," for the word "hoo" may with much more propriety be referred to the person to whom the sacrifice was to be made, than to the thing sacrificed. If not understood in this way ... it must have been the vow of a heathen or a madman. If a dog, or other unclean animal had met him, he could not have made it a burnt offering."

The above is from the "Cottage Bible," p. 320. The curious investigator is advised to read the whole passage in this work. It is found in the Free Reading Room, Main Street, Salt Lake City. Similar constructions are found Gen. xxxvii: 4; 2 Sam. xv: 4; xx: 5.

If we adopt this rendering, then Jephthah's vow is in full accord with the law. Almost anything could be given to the Lord by a vow. In Lev. xxvii: men and women in different ages, clean beasts and unclean beasts, houses and fields are particularly enumerated. But as burnt offerings only the following could be used: A male animal of the herd, or of the sheep or goats, or of turtle doves, or of young pigeons. Lev. i: 1-17. Hence Jephthah promises that whatever should meet him should be for the Lord, and besides, he would offer a burnt offering.

What confirms this is the narrative itself. "The sacred historian," says Bagster, "informs us that she bewailed her virginity, that she knew no man, and that the Israelitish women went yearly, lethannoth, to comfort or lament with the daughter of Jephthah." Ingram Cobden in his brief commentary, p. 250, says: "And every year the daughters of Israel went to console with her on her misfortune, in being separated from the mothers of Israel." Romaine says: "In the original the words are: 'And it was a law in Israel that the daughters of Israel went yearly to make presents to the daughter of Jephthah, the Gileadite, four days in the year. The word here rendered 'lament' is elsewhere translated reward, hire, gift."

The vow of Hannah, Samuel's mother, bears a striking resemblance to the vow of Jephthah. We read:

"And she vowed a vow, and said, O Lord of hosts, if thou wilt indeed look on the affliction of thine handmaid, and remember me, and not forget thine handmaid, but will give unto thine handmaid a man child, then I will give him unto the Lord."

Here indeed is no burnt-offering mentioned in the vow, but when the time came to deliver Samuel to the Lord, then "She took him up with her, with three bullocks ... and brought him unto the House of the Lord. And they slew the bullock and brought the child to Eli." 1 Samuel, i: 11-25. There is no doubt in my mind that this is exactly what Jephthah did, too. He slew a bullock as his burnt offering, and he brought his daughter to the House of the Lord.

It was customary to devote certain persons to the service of the Lord. In Numbers xxxi, 40, we read of thirty-two virgins thus given to the Lord. They performed various offices in the House of God. Some belonged to the choir (see Ezra ii, 65,) and all seemed to be excused from performing any secular work, including marriage.

One more remark. Jephthah had just at this time commenced to rise to prominence in Israel. His victory had brought him to the front of the nation, and through his daughter, his only child, he had prospects of being associated with the most notable families of Israel. At this moment he makes his vow, which separates him from his child and deprives him of having posterity through her. Let it be remembered that this was a voluntary act. For Jephthah could, according to the law (Lev. xxvii: 4), have bought his consecrated daughter back for the sum of 30 shekels. But instead of doing this, he gives her up, and she is willing to be given up, to the Lord. When I reflect on this, I find no difficulty in seeing why the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the book of Doc. and Cov. place Jephthah among the great Saints of the earth. He well deserves the place.

A Delusion.

The Evanston (Wyoming) Chieftain has the following:

"A Chance for Every One to Make a Fortune.—Mr. E. F. Beck, of Salt Lake, is in Evanston for a few days selling good building lots for \$20, and only \$10 cash payment required. They are close in to Salt Lake City, and in a few years will be worth many times their present cost. It is just such cheap lots as these that have made the princely fortunes of many of the wealthy men of Omaha, Kansas City, Denver and other places."

We don't know the exact location of those \$20 lots, but we know Salt Lake pretty well, and there is no place where such valuable lots—in prospective—as those described can be obtained at such figures. The cheapest lots for residence purposes on the suburbs of the city, or within two miles of the centre of town, range from \$200 to \$1000 in price. Farming lands near town are held at \$500 to \$1600 per acre. Anyone who thinks he can get a lot near this city now for \$20 that will bring him a "princely fortune" will be sadly disappointed. Good property can be obtained, but only at a good purchase price.

Bear Lake Stake Conference.

Editor *Deseret News*:

Our quarterly conference was held at Paris on August 11th and 12th. Present: President William Budge and Counselors James H. Hart and George Osmond; visitors: Elder Samuel W. Richards and Prof. Hanisch. The Bishops and other leading Elders occupied the stand.

The reports of the Bishops were listened to with increased interest. The speakers were President Wm. Budge, Counselors Jas. H. Hart and Geo. Osmond, Elders Heber C. Rich (returned missionary), Samuel W. Richards and Prof. Hanisch.

The remarks were replete with instruction in character with the spirit of this great work, and suited to the wants and conditions of the people.

The Sabbath schools were represented by Supt. A. Galloway as progressive.

A Board of Education was appointed and sustained by the meeting as follows:

Pres. W. Budge, Jas. H. Hart, Geo. Osmond, E. N. Austin, S. M. Winters, R. S. Spence, J. R. Shepherd, Walter Hoge, Andrew Galloway.

The conference throughout was spirited and instructive, the pleasure being greatly enhanced by the strains of melody rendered efficiently by our stake choir.

T. MINSON,
Stake Clerk.

Municipal Officers.

The Utah Commission have issued certificates of election to the following recently elected officers:

Morgan City, Morgan County—Mayor S. Francis; councilors, J. Rawler, J. R. Stewart, C. A. Welch, J. Williams, G. Helner; marshal, H. C. Edgington; treasurer, T. F. Welch; assessor and collector, J. Wells; recorder, James Durrant; justices of the peace, J. R. Stewart and Conrad Smith.

Parowan City, Iron County—Mayor, W. C. Mitchell; councilors, Morgan Richards, Jr., John Bentley, H. L. Adams, N. S. Whitney, G. W. Decker, Thomas Taylor, W. Adams, Jr.; recorder, J. S. Hyatt; assessor and collector, Alex. Matheson; marshal, Geo. Taylor; treasurer, S. T. Orton; justices of the peace, J. H. Henderson and Jas. Oberton.

Cedar City—Mayor, Charles Heyborne; councilors, Thos. Thorley, David Haight, M. D. Higbee, S. T. Leigh, O. P. Tretwell; recorder and auditor, J. T. Wilkinson; marshal, Edward Parry; treasurer, Henry Leigh; justices of the peace, J. T. Wilkinson and D. T. Leigh.

Bear River Town, Box Elder County—President, M. C. Mortenson; trustees, Carl Jensen, Andrew Anderson, Ole Hansen, C. C. Jorgensen.

Willard City, Box Elder County—Mayor, J. J. Ward; Councilors, E. Morgan, G. Morgan, G. Harding, J. L. Edwards, A. Ward, C. H. Dudley; recorder, W. P. Owens; marshal, R. Nebeker; assessor and collector, O. A. Wells; treasurer, W. E. Cole.

Corinne City, Box Elder County—Justices of the peace, F. H. Church, M. D. Cox; councilors, R. G. Welsh, D. D. Ryan, J. A. Kromes, Henry Foxley, Henry Heltrich.

Richfield, Sevier Co.—Mayor, W. H. Seegmiller; councilors, Simon Christensen, Morten Jensen, W. H. Clark, W. E. Thurber, William Nelson, L. H. Outzen; justices of the peace, Victor E. Bean, W. C. B. Orrock, S. Christensen; assessor and collector, H. P. Hansen; recorder, William Ogden; treasurer, J. M. Peterson; marshal, L. A. Bean.

Mendon, Cache County—Mayor, Andrew Jensen; councilors, Abraham Sorensen, M. Bird, Peter Larsen, Jeremiah Baker, G. W. Baker, Jr., Jens Jensen; justices of the peace, Alfred Gardner, Christian Sorensen, G. W. Baker, Jr.; marshal, Alex. H. Richards; recorder, Isaac Sorensen; treasurer, Alfred Gardner; assessor and collector, Robert Foster.

Washington City, Washington County—Mayor, R. Gould; recorder, A. Sprawl; assessor and collector, M. O. Funk; marshal, Thomas Blazard; justices of the peace, W. J. Jolly, S. A. Dunn; councilors, G. W. M. Averill, J. P. Childester, J. H. Crawford, P. E. VanOrden, J. B. Allen, N. Sandberg.

Notes From Ogden.

Last Sunday night a tramp was run over by a freight train in the yards at Carter, Wyoming. The body which was fearfully mutilated, was given in charge of the authorities. Nothing was elicited from the coroner's inquest except that the name of the unfortunate was Michael J. Kinnerty.

Mr. John Hunt, the notice of whose death is in another column, was a well known citizen of Ogden and his demise will be unexpected news to his friends. He was taken sick on the 9th and passed away early on the 12th. He leaves a wife and children, with whom there is general sympathy in their affliction.

What will the aristocracy of the Capital want next? They are howling because the city officials do not go about with mowing machines and cut the weeds in the streets. What's the matter with letting stray cattle roam around and eat the weeds? No complaints about weeds in the Ogden streets. The cattle here are so well educated that with only half an invitation they will step inside and eat up whatever you may happen to have in your lot, after picking in the street becomes short. Suppose we send some of ours down. Will you treat them as well as our own officials do, Salt Lake?

Yesterday while Mr. A. P. Bowman was working at the bluff, just west of Weber bridge, fixing a chute for dumping dirt into the wagons hauling on the depot grade, he made a curious find. A set of burglars' tools were unearthed, consisting of a breast drill in six pieces, four bits, two tampering rods with padded heads and two cans of powder. The tools were rusty and had evidently been in the ground some time. Who the owners of the property are cannot of course be guessed. One thing is evident, the tools have not been used for some years. If any old cracksmen have mislaid anything of the kind, they might call around, prove property and take it away.

Yesterday morning a vicious-looking Mongolian named Ching Hing Wy passed through Ogden in charge of Sheriff J. H. Ward, of Evanston. About a year ago this man and one of his companions were gambling in a den at Evanston. As is often the case, they quarreled, and Ching Hing ran a knife into his companion, killing him almost instantly, and fled. A reward of \$200 was offered by the Chinese lodge at Evanston, besides a private reward of \$100. About three years ago the murderer was arrested in Ogden for disturbing the peace. Marshal Ballantyne made the arrest and remembered him well. Two months ago he located him in Idaho. He wrote to Evanston inquiring about him and the rewards. The reply came that the authorities of that place were on his track. They failed to find him, however, and Marshal Ballantyne lost track of him until a few days ago when he learned of his whereabouts. He then wrote to Sheriff Ward telling him that he could find his man at Bellevue, Idaho, and also gave a description of the murderer. The sheriff at once started out in search for him. Ching Hing became suspicious and fled to Hailey. Ward followed him and succeeded in arresting him last Sunday. Marshal Ballantyne received a dispatch to that effect and yesterday met the officer and his prisoner at the depot where he recognized the murderer. Ching Hing had previously sought to persuade the officer that he had the wrong man, but cowed upon being brought face to face with the marshal. Yesterday morning the murderer was taken to Evanston. —Ogden Standard.

Geisford's Sad End.

The funeral services over the remains of George Geisford were held at the residence of Alexander Brown, at Lynne, yesterday. Mr. Geisford was about 28 years of age and in good circumstances financially. He lived pleasantly with his family, which consisted of a wife and three children, and was never heard to complain of life or its ills. His self-destruction is, therefore, strange indeed to those acquainted with him, as they are at a loss to conceive any cause for the deed. He was at his ranch in the north, his little girl of five years, being the only one with him. Before shooting himself he asked the child if she would like to die, too. She replied, No, she didn't want to die. At this he placed the shotgun to his side, pushed on the trigger with a stick, and when the neighbors came, in response to the cries of the little girl, his clothes were found to be on fire. He had just got his crop harvested, and was about to start for Lynne for his wife, who had been there sick for a few weeks. —Ogden Standard, Aug. 16.

In 1850 "Brown's Bronchial Troches" were introduced, and their success as a cure for Colds, Coughs, Asthma and Bronchitis has been unparalleled.

INVENTION

has revolutionized the world during the last half century. Not least among the wonders of inventive progress is a method and system of work that can be performed all over the country without separating the workers from their homes. Pay liberal; any one can do the work; either sex, young or old; no special ability required. Capital not needed; you are started free. Give this out and return to us and we will send you free, something of great value and importance to you, that will start you in business, which will bring you in more money right away, than anything else in the world. Grand offer free. Address: TOWN & CO., Augusta, Maine.

DUE-BILLS, ORDERS AND RECEIPTS in books of 50 or 100 with with stubs at 25c. or 40c. per book, at the DESERET News Office.