

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 6th, 1870, eight o'clock, P. M.

TO PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—In reply to your note just received to preach in the Tabernacle to-morrow, I have to say that after disclaiming and declining, as you have done to-day, the discussion which I came here to hold, other arrangements to speak in the city were accepted by me, which will preclude my compliance with your invitation.

Respectfully,

J. P. NEWMAN.

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T., Aug. 6, 1870.

REV. DR. NEWMAN:

Sir:—In accordance with our usual custom of tendering clergymen of every denomination, passing through our city, the opportunity of preaching in our tabernacles of worship, I sent you, this afternoon, an invitation tendering you the use of the small tabernacle in the morning, or the New Tabernacle in the afternoon, or both, at your pleasure, which you have seen proper to decline.

You charge me with "disclaiming and declining the discussion" which you came here to hold. I ask you, sir, what right have you to charge me with declining a challenge which I never gave you, or, to assume, as a challenge from me, the writing of any unauthorized newspaper editor? Admitting that you could distort the article in question to be a challenge from me (which I do not believe you conscientiously could), was it not the duty of a gentleman to ascertain whether I was responsible for the so-called challenge before your assumption of such a thing? And certainly much more so before making your false charges.

Your assertion that if you had not chosen to construe the article in question as a challenge from me, I "could then have adopted the 'Telegraph' as your [my] organ and the said article as a challenge," is an insinuation, in my judgment, very discreditable to yourself, and ungentlemanly in the extreme, and forces the conclusion that the author of it would not scruple to make use of such a subterfuge himself.

You say that Mr. Sloan is the author of the article; if so, he is perfectly capable of defending it, and I have no doubt you will find him equally willing to do so; or Professor Orson Pratt, whose name, it appears, is the only one suggested in the article. I am confident he would be willing to meet you, as would hundreds of our elders, whose fitness and respectability I would consider beyond question.

In conclusion I will ask, What must be the opinion of every candid, reflecting mind, who views the facts as they appear? Will they not consider it a paltry and insignificant attempt, on your part, to gain notoriety, regardless of the truth? This you may succeed in obtaining; but I am free to confess, as my opinion, that you will find such notoriety more unenviable than profitable, and as disgraceful, too, as it is unworthy of your profession.

If you think you are capable of proving the doctrine of "Plurality of Wives" unscriptural, tarry here as a missionary; we will furnish you the suitable place, the congregations, and plenty of our elders, any of whom will discuss with you on that or any other scriptural doctrine.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 8th, 1870.

TO PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—Your last note, delivered to me on Sunday morning, and to which, of course, I would not on that day reply, does not at all surprise me.

It will be, however, impossible for you to conceal from the public the truth, that, with the full knowledge of my being present in your city for the purpose of debating with you or your representative the question of polygamy, you declined to enter into any arrangements for such a discussion; and after this fact was ascertained, I felt at liberty to comply with a subsequent request from other parties, which had been fully arranged before the reception of your note of invitation to preach in your tabernacles.

I must frankly say that I regard your professed courtesy, extended under the circumstances, as it was, a mere device to cover, if possible, your unwillingness to have a fair discussion of the matter in question in the hearing of your people.

Your comments upon "disclaiming and declining the discussion" are simply a reiteration of the *disclaimer*; while, in regard to your notice of my construction of the article in the *Telegraph* of May last, I have only to leave the representations you have seen fit to make to the judgment of a candid public, sure to discover who it is that has been resorting to "subterfuge" in this affair. Your intimation that Elder Sloan, Prof. Pratt, or hundreds of other Mormon elders, would be willing to discuss the question of Polygamy with me from a Bible standpoint, and your impertinent suggestion that I tarry here as a missionary for that purpose, I am compelled to regard as cheap and safe attempts to avoid the appearance of shrinking from such a discussion by seeming to invite it after it had, by your own action, been rendered impossible. As to the elders you speak of, including yourself, being ready to meet me in public debate, I have to say that I came here with that understanding and expectation, but it was rudely dispelled, on being definitely tested. Were it possible to reduce these vague suggestions of yours to something like a distinct proposition for a debate, there is still nothing in your action, so far, to assure me of your sincerity, but, on the contrary, every thing to cause me to distrust it.

I have one more point of remark. You have insinuated that my motive is a thirst for "notoriety." I can assure you that if I had been animated by such a motive, you give me small credit for good sense by supposing that I would employ such means. Neither you, nor the system of which you are the head, could afford me any "notoriety" to be desired.

But, to show how far I have been governed by merely personal aspirations, let the simple history of the case be recalled.

You send your Delegate to Congress who, in the House of Representatives, and in sight and hearing of the whole Nation, throws down the gauntlet upon the subject of Polygamy as treated in the Bible. Being Chaplain of the American Senate, and having been consulted by several public men, I deemed it my duty to preach upon the subject. The discourse was published in the New York "Herald," and on this reaching your city one of your Elders published an article which is generally construed as a challenge to me to debate the question with you, or some one whom you should appoint, here in your tabernacle. Acting upon this presumption, I visit your city, taking the earliest opportunity to inform you, as the head of the Mormon Church, of my purpose, and suggesting the steps usual in such cases. You then reply, ignoring the whole subject, but without a hint of your "pleasure" about my preaching in the Tabernacle.

Subsequently other arrangements were made which precluded my accepting any invitation to speak in your places of worship. The day passed away, and after sunset I received your note of invitation, my reply to which will answer for itself. And this you intimate is an attempt on my part to obtain an "unenviable notoriety."

Sir, I have done with you—make what representation of the matter you think proper, you will not succeed in misleading the discriminating people either of this Territory or of the country generally by any amount of verbiage you may choose to employ.

Respectfully, etc.,

J. P. NEWMAN:

---

[The communication referred to in the letter below was addressed to Dr. Newman by five persons, who asked him whether it was a fact that he was unwilling to debate the question of polygamy now and here, as that was the impression, they say, the *Deseret Evening News* and *Salt Lake Herald* conveyed.]

---

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 9th, 1870.

TO MR. BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—In view of the enclosed communications, received from several citizens of this place, asking whether I am ready now and here to debate the question, "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" with you, as the Chief of the Church of Latter-day Saints, and in view of the defiant tone of your Church journals of last evening and

this morning; and in view of the fact that I have been here now four days waiting to have you inform me of your willingness to meet me in public discussion on the above question, but having received no such intimation up to this time of writing, therefore, I do now and here challenge you to meet me in personal and public debate, on the aforesaid question. I respectfully suggest that you appoint two gentlemen to meet Rev. Dr. Sunderland and Dr. J. P. Taggart, who represent me, to make all necessary arrangements for the discussion.

Be kind enough to favor me with an immediate reply.

Respectfully,

J. P. NEWMAN.

Residence of Rev. Mr. Pierce.

---

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T., August 9th, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—Your communication of to-day's date, with accompanying enclosure, was handed to me a few moments since by Mr. Black.

In reply, I will say that I accept the challenge to debate the question "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" Professor Orson Pratt or Hon. John Taylor acting as my representative, and in my stead in the discussion. I will furnish the place of holding the meetings, and appoint two gentlemen to meet Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart, to whom you refer as your representatives, to make the necessary arrangements.

I wish the discussion to be conducted in a mild, peaceable, quiet spirit, that the people may receive light and intelligence and all be benefitted; and then let the congregation decide for themselves.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG:

---

CITY, Aug. 9th, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—I have appointed Messrs. A. Carrington and Jos. W. Young to meet with Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart, to arrange preliminaries for the discussion.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

---

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 9th, 1870.

TO MR. BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—I challenged *you* to a discussion and not Orson Pratt or John Taylor. You have declined to debate personally with me. Let the public distinctly understand this fact, whatever may have been your reasons for so declining. Here I think I might reasonably rest the case. However, if Orson Pratt is prepared to take the affirmative of the question, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I am prepared to take the negative, and Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart will meet Messrs. Carrington and Young to-night at 8 o'clock at the office of Mr. Taggart to make the necessary arrangements.

Respectfully, &c.,

J. P. NEWMAN.

---

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T. Aug. 10th 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—I am informed by Messrs. Carrington and Young that at their meeting last evening, with Drs. Sunderland and Taggart, they were unable to come to a decision with regard to the wording of the subject of debate.

Bearing in mind the following facts: Firstly, that you are the challenging party; secondly, that in a sermon delivered by you in the city of Washington, before President Grant and his Cabinet, Members of Congress and many other prominent gentlemen, you assumed to prove that "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons," it certainly seems strange that your representatives should persistently refuse to have any other question discussed than the one "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" It appears to the representatives of Mr. Pratt that if Dr. Newman could undertake to prove in Washington that "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons," he ought not to refuse to make the same affirmation in Salt Lake City. Mr. Pratt, I discover, entertains the same opinion, but rather than to permit the discussion to fall, he will not press for your original proposition, but will accept the question as you now state it: "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?"

I sincerely trust that none of the gentlemen forming the committee will encumber the discussion with unnecessary regulations, which will be irksome to both parties and unproductive of good, and that no obstacles will be thrown in the way of having a free and fair discussion.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

# THE BIBLE AND POLYGAMY.

---

## DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLYGAMY?

---

DISCUSSION BETWEEN PROFESSOR ORSON PRATT, SEN., AND DR. J. P. NEWMAN,  
CHAPLAIN OF THE U. S. SENATE, IN THE NEW TABERNAACLE,  
SALT LAKE CITY, AUGUST 12, 13 AND 14, 1870.

---

### FIRST DAY.

---

At two o'clock yesterday afternoon Professor Pratt and Dr. Newman, with their friends and the umpires, met in the stand of the New Tabernacle: the two former gentlemen prepared for the discussion of the question, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" An audience of three or four thousand—at least half of which was of the gentler sex—assembled to hear the discussion. At a few minutes past two, the audience was called to order by Judge C. M. Hawley, the umpire of Dr. Newman, on the negative, he (fortunately we presume) being absent from his district at this juncture—and Elder John Taylor offered the opening prayer. The same umpire, who somehow or other had got the idea that he was the master of ceremonies on the occasion, and that he would relieve the umpire of the affirmative side from all his duties, then introduced Professor Pratt to the audience, which, as the Professor was so well known and the umpire almost unknown, created a slight titter, which, however, speedily subsided, and the assemblage listened quietly to the

#### Argument of Professor Orson Pratt.

I appear before this audience to discuss a subject that is certainly important to us, and no doubt is interesting to the country at

large, namely: the subject of plurality of wives, or, as the question is stated, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I would state, by way of apology to the audience, that I have been unaccustomed, nearly all my life, to debate. It is something new to me. I do not recollect of ever having held more than one or two debates, in the course of my life, on any subject. I think the last one was some thirty years ago, in the city of Edinburgh. But I feel great pleasure this afternoon in appearing before this audience for the purpose of examining the question under discussion. I shall simply read what is stated in the Bible, and make such remarks as I may consider proper upon the occasion.

I will call your attention to a passage which will be found in Deuteronomy, the 21st chapter, from the 15th to the 17th verse:

If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born be hers that was hated: Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born: But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his.

Here is a law, in the words of the Great Law-giver himself, the Lord, who spake to Moses; and it certainly must be a sanction of a plurality of wives, for it is given to regulate inheritances in families of that description, as well as in families wherein the first wife may have been divorced, or may be dead; wives contemporary and wives that are successive. It refers to both classes; and inasmuch as plurality of wives is nowhere condemned in the law of God, we have a right to believe from this law that plurality of wives is just as legal and proper as that of the marriage of a single wife. This is the ground we are forced to take until we can find some law, some evidence, some testimony to the contrary. They are acknowledged as wives in this passage, at least—"If a man have two wives." It is well known that the House of Israel at that time practised both monogamy and polygamy. They were not exclusively monogamists: neither were they exclusively polygamists. There were monogamic families existing in Israel in those days, and therefore in the Lord giving this he referred not only to successive wives, where a man had married after the death of his first wife, or if the first wife had been divorced for some legal cause, but to wives who were contemporary, as there were many families in Israel, which can be proved if necessary, that were polygamists. I might here refer to the existence of this principle concerning the rights of the first-born in monogamic and polygamic families prior to the date of this law. This seems to have been given to regulate a question that had a prior existence. I will refer, before I proceed from this passage to the monogamic family of Isaac, wherein we have the declaration that Esau and Jacob, being twins, had a dispute, or at least there was an ill feeling on the part of Esau, because Jacob at a certain time had purchased the right of the first-born—that is, his birth-right. The first-born, though twins, and perhaps a few moments intervening

between the first and second, or only a short time, had rights, and those rights were respected and honored centuries before the days of Moses. This was a monogamic family, so far as we are informed; for if Isaac had more than one wife, the Bible does not inform us. We come to Jacob, who was a polygamist, and whose first-born son pertained to the father and not to the mother. There were not four first-born sons to Jacob who were entitled to the rights of the first-born, but only one. The first-born to Jacob was Reuben, and he would have retained the birth-right had he not transgressed the law of heaven. Because of transgression he lost that privilege. It was taken from him and given to Joseph, or rather to the two sons of Joseph, as you will find recorded in the fifth chapter of 1st Chronicles. Here then the rights of the first-born were acknowledged, in both polygamic and monogamic families, before the law under consideration was given. The House of Israel was not only founded in polygamy, but the two wives of Jacob, and the two handmaidens, that were also called his wives, were the women with whom he begat the twelve sons from whom the twelve tribes of Israel sprang; and polygamy having existed with Israel or Jacob, the founders of that nation, was continued among them from generation to generation down until the coming of Christ; and these laws therefore were intended to regulate an institution already in existence. If the law is limited to monogamic families only, it will devolve upon my learned opponent to bring forth evidence to establish this point.

We will next refer to a passage which will be found in Exodus, 21st chapter, 10th verse. It may be well to read the three preceding verses, commencing with the 7th: "And if a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed; to sell her into a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he hath betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish." Also the following verse, the 11th: "And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money." I think from the nature of this passage that it certainly does have reference to two lawful wives. It may be that objection will be taken to the word "wife"—"another wife"—from the fact that it is in Italics, and was so placed by the translators of King James, according to the best judgment they could form, taking into consideration the text. I do not intend at present to dwell at any great length upon this passage, merely declaring that this does sanction plurality of wives, so far as my judgment and opinion are concerned, and so far as the literal reading of the Scriptures exhibits, it does sanction the taking of another wife, while the first is still living. If this word "wife" could be translated "woman," that perhaps might alter the case, providing it can be proved that it should be so from the original, which may be referred to on this point, and it may not. We have the privilege, I believe, of taking the Bible

according to King James' translation, or of referring to the original, providing we can find any original. But so far as the original is concerned, from which this was translated, it is not in existence. The last information we have of the original manuscripts from which this was translated, is that they were made into the form of kites and used for amusement, instead of being preserved. With regard to a great many other manuscripts, they may perhaps agree with the original of King James' translation, or they may not. We have testimony and evidence in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana that the original manuscripts contained a vast number of readings, differing materially one from the other. We have this statement from some of the best informed men, and in several instances it has been stated that there are 30,000 different readings of these old original manuscripts from which the Bible was translated. Men might dispute over these readings all the days of their lives and there would be a difference of opinion, there were so many of them. This, then, is another law, regulating, in my estimation, polygamy.

I will now refer to another law on the subject of polygamy, in the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy—I do not recollect the verse, but I will soon find it—it commences at the 5th verse. "If brethren dwell together"—Now, it is well enough in reading this, to refer to the margin, as we have the privilege of appealing to it, so you will find in the margin the words "next kinsmen," or "brethren." "If brethren—or next kinsmen—dwell together:"

If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her.

And it shall be, *that* the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother *which is* dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.

And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother.

Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him: and *if* he stand *to it*, and say, I like not to take her;

Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house.

And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of him that hath his shoe loosed.

It may be asked, What has this to do with polygamy? I answer that as the law is general, it is binding upon brethren and upon all near kinsmen dwelling together. Not unmarried brethren or unmarried kinsmen only, but the married and unmarried. The law is general. If it can be proved from the original, or from any source whatever, that the law is not general, then the point will have to be given up. But if that cannot be proven, then here is a law that not only sanctions polygamy, but *commands* it; and if we can find one law where a command is given, then plurality of wives will be established on a permanent footing, equal in legality to that of mon-



ogamy. This law of God absolutely does command all persons, whether married or unmarried, it makes no difference—brethren dwelling together, or near kinsmen dwelling together—which shows that it is not unmarried persons living in the same house that are meant, but persons living together in the same neighborhood, in the same country in Israel, as it is well known that Israel in ancient days did so dwell together; and the law was binding upon them. This was calculated to make a vast number of polygamists in Israel from that day until the coming of Christ. And the Christian religion must have admitted these polygamists into the Church, because they would have been condemned if they had not observed this law. There was a penalty attached to it, and they could not be justified and refuse to obey it. Hence there must have been hundreds, perhaps thousands, of polygamists in Israel, when Jesus came, who were living in obedience to this law and who would have been condemned if they had disobeyed it. When the gospel was preached to them, if they could not have been admitted into the Christian Church without divorcing their wives God would have been unjust to them, for if they, through their obedience to God's law, should have been cut off from the gospel, would it not have been both inconsistent and unjust? But as there is no law either in the Old or New Testament against polygamy, and as we here find polygamy commanded, we must come to the conclusion that it is a legal form of marriage. We cannot come to any other conclusion, for it stands on a par with the monogamic form of marriage; consequently wherever we find either righteous men or wicked men, whatever may be their practices in the course of their lives, it does not affect the legality of their marriage with one wife or with two wives.

We may refer you to Cain, who had but one wife, so far as we are informed. He was a monogamist. He was also a very wicked man, having killed his own brother. We find he was driven out into the land of Nod. Of course, as the Lord had not created any females in the land of Nod, Cain must have taken his wife with him, and there was born a son to him in that land. Shall we condemn monogamy and say it was sinful because Cain was a murderer? No; that will never do. We can bring no argument of this kind to destroy monogamy, or the one-wife system, and make it illegal. We come down to the days of Lamech. He was another murderer. He happened to be a polygamist; but he did not commit his murder in connection with polygamy, so far as the Scriptures give any information. There is no connection between the law of polygamy and the murder he committed in slaying a young man. Does that, therefore, invalidate the marriage of two persons to Lamech? No; it stands on just as good ground as the case of Cain, who was a monogamist and a murderer also.

Adam was a monogamist. But was there any law given to Adam to prevent him taking another wife? If there was such a law, it is not recorded in King James' translation. If there be such a law recorded, perhaps it is in some of the originals that differed so much from each other. It may be argued in the case of Adam, that the Lord created but one woman to begin the peopling of this earth. If

the Lord saw proper to create but one woman for that purpose, he had a perfect right to do so.

The idea that that has any bearing upon the posterity of Adam because the Lord did not create two women would be a very strange idea indeed. There are a great many historical facts recorded concerning the days of Adam that were not to be examples to his posterity. For instance, he was ordered to cultivate the garden of Eden—one garden. Was that any reason why his posterity should not cultivate two gardens? Would any one draw the conclusion that, because God gave a command to Adam to cultivate the garden of Eden, to dress it and keep it, that his posterity to the latest time should all have one garden each, and no more? There is no expression of a law in these matters; they are simply historical facts. Again, God gave him clothing on a certain occasion, the Lord himself being the tailor—clothing to cover the nakedness of Adam and of Eve his wife; and this clothing was made from the skins of beasts. This is a historical fact. Will any one say that all the posterity of Adam shall confine their practice in accordance with this historical fact? Or that it was an expression of law from which they must not deviate? By no means. If the posterity of Adam see fit to manufacture clothing out of wool, or flax, or cotton, or any other material whatever, would any one argue in this day that they were acting in violation of the law of the Divine Creator, of a law expressed and commanded in the early ages? Why, no. We should think a man had lost all powers of reason who would argue this way. As our delegate remarked in his speech, Adam had taken all the women in the world, or that were made for him. If there had been more, he might have taken them: there was nothing in the law to limit him.

I would like to dwell upon this longer, but I have many other passages to which I wish to draw your attention. The next passage to which I will refer, you will find in Numbers, 31st chapter, 17th and 18th verses. This chapter gives us a history of the proceedings of this mixed race of polygamists and monogomists called Israel. At a certain time they went out to battle against the nation of Midianites: and having smote the men, they took all the women captives, as you will find in the 9th verse. Commencing at the 15th verse, we read:

And Moses said unto them have ye saved all the women alive? Behold these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord.

You will recollect the case of some Midianitish women being brought into the camp of Israel contrary to the law of God, not being wives; and Israel with them sinned and transgressed the law of heaven, and the Lord sent an awful plague into their midst for this transgression. Now, here was a large number of women saved, and Moses, finding they were brought into camp, said these had caused the children of Israel to sin; and he gave command: "Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women chil-

dren, that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." How many were there of this great company that they were to keep alive for themselves? There was something very strange in this. If they had caused Israel to sin why spare them? Or why keep them alive for themselves? That they might have them lawfully. Some may say to have them as servants, not as wives. Some might have been kept as servants and not as wives, but would there not have been great danger of Israel sinning again with so many thousand servants, as they were the same women who had brought the plague into the camp of Israel before? How many were there of these women? Thirty-two thousand, as you will find in another verse of the same chapter. And these were divided up as you will also find, in the latter part of the same chapter, among the children of Israel. Those who stayed at home from the war took a certain portion—sixteen thousand in number; those who went to the war, including the Levites, took the remaining sixteen thousand.

Now to show that polygamy was practised among the children of Israel in taking captive women, let me refer you to another passage of Scripture, in Deuteronomy, 21st chapter, commencing at the 10th verse,

When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive;

And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to thy wife:

Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails;

And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.

And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.

Now, this law was given to a nation, as I have already shown, which practised polygamy as well as monogamy; and consequently if a polygamist saw a woman, a beautiful woman, among the captives; or if a monogamist saw a beautiful woman among the captives; or if an unmarried man saw a beautiful woman among the captives, the law being general, they had an equal right to take them as wives. This will explain the reason why the Lord told Israel to save thirty-two thousand Midianitish women alive for themselves. It will be recollected that the Israelites already had a surplus of women. I have no need to refer to the destruction of the males that had been going on for a long period of time—about eighty years, until Moses went to deliver Israel from Egypt. During this time females were spared alive, making a surplus of them in the midst of Israel; but the Lord saw there were not enough, and he made provision for more by commanding them to spare these captive women and keep them alive for themselves. If my opponent, who will follow me, can bring forth any evidence from the law of God, or from the passage under consideration, to prove that this law was limited to unmarried men, all right; we will yield the point, if there can be evidence brought

forward to that effect. "When you go forth to war if you see a beautiful woman"—not you unmarried men alone, but all that go forth to war.

The next passage to which I will refer you, where God absolutely commands polygamy, will be found in Exodus, 22d chapter, 16th and 17th verses :

And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.

If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

There is the law of Exodus ; now let us turn to the law of Deuteronomy, 22d chapter, 28th and 29th verses, on the same subject :

If a man find a damsel *that is* a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found ;

Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty *shekels* of silver, and she shall be his wife ; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

Does this mean an unmarried man? The law was given to a nation wherein both forms of marriage were recognized, and wherein single men existed. If it does mean single men alone, we would like to hear the proof. The law is general. Whether married or unmarried, whether a monogamist or polygamist, if he committed this crime, if he found a maid and committed the crime there specified, of seduction, there is the law ; he shall marry her, and shall not only marry her, but shall pay a fine of fifty shekels of silver to the father. This was the penalty ; not that they were justified in the act. It mattered not whether he was a polygamist, a monogamist, or an unmarried man, he must comply with the law as a penalty. That was another command establishing and sanctioning polygamy, sanctioning it by Divine command. If this law could have been put in force in modern times, among modern Christian nations, what a vast amount of evil would have been avoided in the earth. It is proverbial that among all the nations of modern Europe, as well as in our own great nation—Christian nations—there is a vast amount of prostitution, houses of ill-fame, and prostitutes of various classes ; now, if this law, which God gave to Israel, had been re-enacted by the law-makers and legislatures and parliaments of these various nations, what would have been the consequence? In a very short time there would not have been a house of ill-fame in existence. Their inmates would have all been married off to their seducers, or their patrons ; for who does not know that females would far rather be married than prostitute themselves as they do at the present time? And they would lie in wait to entrap this man and that man, and the other man, to get out of these brothels, and, as the law is general, if the same law had existed in our day, it would soon have broken up houses of ill-fame. There might have been some secret evils, but it would have broken up the "social evil," as practised openly.

The next passage to which I will refer you is in 2d Chronicles, 24th chapter, 2d, 3d, 15th and 16th verses :

And Joash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest. And Jehoiada took for him two wives, and he begat sons and daughters.

According to the ideas of monogamists, Jehoiada must have been a very wicked man, and Joash "a beastly polygamist" for taking two wives. We will take the man who received the wives first. Joash, who received the wives from the highest authority God had on the earth, "did right in the sight of the Lord, all the days of Jehoiada the priest." What! Did he do right when Jehoiada took two wives for him and gave them to him? Yes; so says the word of God, the Bible, and you know the question is "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" But what a dreadful priest that man must have been, according to the arguments of monogamists! Let us see what kind of a character he appears. In this same chapter, and in the 15th and 16th verses we read:

But Jehoiada waxed old, and was full of days when he died; a hundred and thirty years old was he when he died. And they buried him in the city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both toward God, and toward his house.

"Because he had done good in Israel, both toward God and toward his house," they buried him among the kings, honored him in that manner; and the reason why they did bestow this great honor upon him was because he had done good. In the first place he had given two wives to Joash, which was a very good act, for he was the highest authority God had upon the earth at that time; and God sanctioned polygamy by lengthening out the age of this man to 130 years, a very long age in those days.

But I shall have to hasten on, although there are many passages which I have not time to quote. The next will be found in Hosea, 1st chapter, 2nd and 3rd verses: "The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea." This was the introduction of Hosea as a prophet. No doubt he brought the evidence as a prophet; and in the beginning of the word of God through Hosea, to the world, he must have come with great proof. The first thing the Lord said to him, was "Go take unto thee a wife of whoredoms." In the 3rd verse it says: "So he went and took Gomer, the daughter of Diblain." If such a thing had occurred in our day; if a man had come forth, professing to be a prophet, and the first thing he said as a prophet was that the Lord had revealed to him that he was to go and take a wife of such a character, what would be thought of him? Yet he was a true prophet. Was this the only wife God commanded Hosea to take? No. The Lord said—"Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friends, yet an adulteress"—See chapter 3rd. What, love a woman, an adulteress, when he already had a wife of very bad character! Take wives of such disgraceful reputation? Yet God commanded this, and he must be obeyed. This did not justify any other prophet in doing so. Jeremiah would not have been justified in doing the same. But this was a command of God, given to Hosea alone. It was not given as a pattern for any other man to follow after, or for the people of this generation to observe. Yet it

was given in this instance. "But," inquires one, "does not the Lord require such characters to be put to death?" Yes, but in this instance, it seems, the Lord deviated from this law; for he commanded a holy prophet to go and marry two women. This recalls to my mind the law given to Israel, recorded in Deuteronomy, where the Lord commanded the law of consanguinity to be broken. You will recollect that in two different chapters the Lord pointed out who should not marry within certain degrees of consanguinity; yet in the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy he commanded brethren, who dwell together, and near kinsmen, to break that law, which was a justification in part to not regard the law of consanguinity. God has a right to alter his commands as he pleases. Go back to the days of Noah, and the command was given: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" yet the same God commanded Abraham, that good man who is up yonder in the kingdom of God, according to the New Testament, to take his son Isaac and slay him and offer him up as a burnt offering. Here is one command in opposition to another. Consequently, God does sometimes give a command in opposition to another, but they are not examples for you or me to follow. Supposing I should prove by ten thousand examples from the Bible that polygamy was practised in ancient Israel, is that a reason why you and I should practise it? No; we must have a command for ourselves. God sometimes repeats a command. The Latter-day Saints in this Territory practise polygamy; not because God commanded it in ancient times, not because Moses gave laws to regulate it; not because it was practised by good men of ancient times, but because it is as divinely legal as monogamy and enjoined upon us by divine command.

(At this point the umpires said the time was up.)

Judge C. M. Hawley then introduced Dr. J. P. Newman, who proceeded to deliver the following

## ARGUMENT.

### HONORABLE UMPIRES AND

### LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The question for our consideration is "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" It is of the utmost importance that we proceed to the discussion of this question and the unfolding of its elements at once; and therefore, that we lose no time, we propose to analyze the question. I had desired nine hours to speak on this great subject; but by mutual consent the time has been reduced to three. In view of this fact I, therefore, proceed at once to the consideration of the elements of the question "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" Every word is emphatic. Does the Bible—the Bible—God's word, whether in the original text or in the translation which is accepted

by Christendom as the revealed will of God ; this old book which has come down from the hoary past ; this old book written by different men, under different circumstances, yet for one great and grand object ; this book that comes to us under the authority of plenary inspiration, no matter what has become of the manuscripts, whether lost in the flood or consumed in the flame that burned the doomed Persepolis, no matter what has been their destiny, we have the original, the Hebrew, the Septuagint and the Greek translations ; in the New Testament the Greek, which have been and are accepted by the most eminent Biblical scholars ; therefore the point the gentleman makes that so many manuscripts are lost, is a bagatelle. I throw it away as useless, as a rush. Would he have me infer that because some manuscripts are lost, therefore that book is not the authentic word of God and the revealed will of high heaven ? No ; for him to assume that is to assume that the book is not God's will. Supposing that the original revelation, the pretended revelation, that you, here, were to practise polygamy, was consumed in the flames by the wife of Joseph Smith, does that invalidate the preserved copy which Mr. Joseph Smith had in his bosom ? Certainly not. I hold therefore that that old book comes to us with authority ; and that whatever has become of the manuscripts which have been furnished, formed, arranged and handed down to us, that is our standard.

I am here to speak to the people, and I will be an organ to you in the name of the Lord.

But let us look at this book. It is a book of history and of biography ; of prophecy and precepts ; of promises and of miracles ; of laws and precepts ; of promises and threatenings ; of poetry and of narrative. It is to be judged by the ordinary rules of grammar, of rhetoric and of logic. It is written in human language. There is a language spoken by the persons in the Godhead, and had God revealed himself in that language we could not have understood the terms. There is a language spoken by the angels that blaze before the throne ; had God spoken to us in angelic language we could not have understood the terms. But he took human language, with all its poverty and imperfections, and with all its excellencies. He has spoken to us in terms by which we can understand his pleasure concerning us. But it is a great fact, my friends, that all that is written in the Bible is neither approved by the Almighty, nor was it written for our imitation. Achan stole a Babylonish garment and a wedge of gold. God did not approve the theft, nor are those acts recorded in the Bible for our imitation. We are to read Bible history as we read Xenophon, Tacitus, and Herodotus, and, in modern times, Hume, Gibbon and Bancroft, with this distinction—when we take down Herodotus, Tacitus, or others I have not mentioned, we are not always sure that what we read is true, but we are sure that what is recorded in the Bible is true, whether it be prophetic truth, mandatory truth or historic truth. We should therefore make a distinction, according to the kind of composition we are reading. If we are reading history, read it as history, and make a distinction between what is simply recorded as part and parcel of the record of

a great nation, or part and parcel of the record or biography of some eminent man, and that which is recorded there for our imitation, for which we shall have to give an account at God's bar. So take the poetry of the Bible. Scriptural poetry is subject to the same rules as the poetry in Homer, Virgil, Milton or Young, with this exception—that the poetry of the Bible is used to convey a grand thought, and there is no redundancy of thought or imagery in Bible poetry.

We come to biography, and to my mind it is a sublime fact, and one for which I thank God, that the inspired writers were impartial in recording biographical history. They recorded the virtues and the vices of men; they did not disguise the faults even of their eminent friends, nor did they always stop to pronounce condemnation upon such; but they recorded one and the other, just as they came along the stream of time. It is this book, therefore, that is my standard in this discussion, and it is composed of the Old and New Testament. The New Testament holds the relation to the Old Testament of a commentary in a prominent sense. Christ comes along and gives an exposition of the law of Moses; comes and gives an exposition of some of those grand principles which underlie Christianity; and then his references to the law of Moses simply prove this—that what Moses has said is true. Take his exposition of the Ten Commandments, as they were given amid the thunders of Mount Sinai, and you find that he has written a commentary on the Decalogue, bringing out its hidden meaning, showing to us that the man is an adulterer who not only marries more women than one, but who looks on a woman with salacious lust. Such is the commentary on the law, by the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now does this book, the Old Testament and the New? Not what revelation has been made to the Latter-day Saints; that is not to be brought into this controversy; that is not the question in dispute. Whether Joseph Smith or any other member of the Church of Latter-day Saints has had a revelation from God; whether the holy canon was closed by the apocalyptic revelations to John on the Isle of Patmos—even that question is not to be dragged into this controversy. Neither the Mormon Bible, nor the Book of Covenants, nor the revelations of yesterday or to-day, or any other day; but the grand question is, Does that old book—read in old England, read in Wales, read in Ireland, read in Norway and Sweden, and read in this land of liberty—does that book sanction polygamy?

We now come to another important word—namely, does the Bible sanction? *Sanction!* By the term sanction we mean command, consequently the authority of positive, written, divine law, or whatever may be reasonably held as equivalent to such law. It follows, therefore, that toleration is not sanction. Sufferance is not sanction. Municipal legislation is not sanction. An historical statement of prevailing customs is not sanction. A faithful narrative of the life and example of eminent men is not sanction. The remission of penalty is not sanction. A providential blessing, bestowed upon general principles, for an ulterior purpose is not sanction. The only adequate idea of sanction is the divine and positive approbation,



plainly expressed, either in definite statute or by such forms of conformation as constitute a full and clear equivalent. It is in this sense that we take the term sanction in the question before us.

The next word in the question is, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" By which we mean, as it (the Bible) now stands. Not as it once was, but as it now is; that is, the Bible taken as a whole. The question is not, Did the Bible formerly sanction Polygamy? But rather, Does it, at the present day, authorize and establish and approve it? Just as we may say of the Constitution of the United States, not, Did it sanction slavery? but, Does it now sanction it? For it is a well known principle of jurisprudence that if anything has been repealed in the supreme law of the land, which that law once authorized, then it no longer sanctions the matter in question. It is so here, precisely, for let us suppose for a moment that it could be proved that the Bible once sanctioned polygamy, in the sense accepted, and that this sanction has never been withdrawn, then we are bound to admit that the affirmative has been sustained; but supposing, on the other hand, that the Bible, as it is now, to-day, does not sanction polygamy, then we have sustained the negative of the question.

There is another word, and one of importance, and that is the term polygamy. There are three words in this connection which should be referred to. The first is polygamy, which is from the Greek *polus* and *gamos*, the former meaning "many," and the latter "marriage," and signifies a plurality of wives or husbands at the same time. When a man has more wives than one, or a woman more husbands than one, at the same time, the offender is punishable for polygamy. Such is the fact in Christian countries. Polygamy is allowed in some countries, as in Turkey. Turn to Webster's Dictionary, page 844, and we shall find the word "polyandry," from *polus*, many and *aner*, man, meaning the practice of females having more husbands than one at the same time, or a plurality of husbands. Then there is another word—polygyny, from the Greek *polus*, and *gune*, woman or female, the practice of having more wives than one at the same time. The word, therefore, to be used, is not polygamy, but polygyny, for polygamy signifies a man with more wives than one, or a woman with more husbands than one; and it seems to me that if a man can have more wives than one a woman has the same right to have more husbands than one. Then the true word is polygyny, and hereafter we will scout the word polygamy, and use the true word polygyny.

This question involves or supposes two systems of marriage: What is commonly called polygamy and what is known as monogamy. On the one hand a man with more than one wife; and on the other, a man with only one wife. You observe therefore that these are two systems essentially and radically different and distinct, the one from the other, and especially so in this controversy. The material question to be decided is, which is the authorized system of marriage, polygamy, or a plurality of wives, or monogamy, or what is termed, the one-wife system?

Let us glance for a moment at some of the grand features of

monogamy; and we shall thereby see the distinction between the two systems of marriage. Take, for instance, the design of marriage, as originally established by the Almighty in the garden of Eden, in the time of man's innocency. That design was three-fold: companionship, procreation and prevention. Companionship is first: the soul is more than the body. The union of two loving hearts is more than the union of two bodies. Ere Eve was created or she beheld the rosy sky or breathed its balmy atmosphere, God said, "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make for him a helpmeet." The animals had passed in review before Adam; but neither among the doves that plumed their pinions in the air of Paradise; nor amid the fish of the deep, the beasts of the field, nor the reptiles of the earth could a companion be found for man. But a special exertion of divine power had to be put forth that this companion should be made. And how was she made? A deep sleep is caused to come upon the first man. There lies Adam upon the ambrosial floor of Paradise, and out of his side a rib is taken, and out of that rib woman was created. And when some one asked old Martin Luther—"Why did not God Almighty make the woman out of some other bone of a man than out of a rib?" The answer was: "He did not make woman out of man's head, lest she should rule over him; He did not make her out of the bone of man's foot, lest he should trample upon her; but He made her out of his side, that she might be near his heart; from under his arm, that he might protect her." The grand primary object of marriage, therefore, is companionship—the union of two loving hearts.

The next design is procreation. It has pleased Almighty God to people the earth by the offspring coming from those united in marriage. This was his wisdom: this was his plan. It is an old saying that history repeats itself; and after the flood had swept away the antediluvians, and after that terrible storm had subsided, there, in the ark, were Noah and his sons and their wives—four men and four women. If Almighty God sanctioned polygamy in the beginning, and intended to sanction it afterwards, why did not he save in the ark a dozen wives for Noah and a dozen for each of his sons? But one wife for Noah, and one wife for each of his sons; and thus the Almighty repeats history.

The next design is prevention—namely to prevent the indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes. God loves chastity in man and in woman, and therefore he established marriage. It is a divine institution, lifting man above the brutes. He would not have man as the male of the brute creation—mingling indiscriminately with the females; but he establishes an institution holy as the angels, bearing upon its brow the signet of his approval, and sanctioned by the good and great of all ages. He establishes this institution that the lines may be drawn, and that the chastity of male and female may be preserved.

On passing from this question of design, let us go to the consideration of the very nature of marriage. It is two-fold. It is an institution, not a law; it is a state, not an act: something that has been originated, framed, built up and crowned with glory. It is not an

act of mere sexual intercourse, but it is a state to run parallel with the life of the married pair, unless the bonds of marriage are sundered by one crime—that is adultery. Then consider the grand fact that there are solemn obligations in this institution of marriage. Nay, more than this, the very essential elements of marriage distinguish it in its monogamic, from the institution of marriage in its polygamic, condition. There is choice, preference of one man for one woman, and when we come to the question of the census that will demonstrate it clear as the sunlight; when we come to that question we will prove the equality of the sexes: we will prove that there is not an excess of marriageable women either in this or any other country. Therefore the grand advice of Paul: "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman have her own husband."

Now if the equality of the sexes be a fact, and every man is to have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, then I say that this great idea of choice is fully sustained, of preference on the part of a man, and also preference on the part of woman. And around this institution God has thrown guards to protect it; indeed, he has surrounded it with muniments that seem to be as high as heaven; and whenever the obligations, or so long as the obligations of marriage are observed, then these defenses stand impregnable and the gates of hell shall not prevail against marriage. First, there is its innocency: the union of a man with his wife, is an act as pure as the devotion of angels in heaven. Then comes the nobleness of marriage: the bed undefiled is honorable in all; but whoremongers and adulterers will God judge. Then notice the sanction of divine and human law that surrounds this institution; the law that was given amid the awful thunderings of Mount Sinai is a grand muniment of this monogamic institution. In all civilized Christian countries civil legislation has extended the arm of the law to protect marriage. Then recall the affinities of the sexes: the natural desire of man for woman; and the natural desire of woman for man. There may be some exceptions. Now and then we find an old bachelor in the world; but a man without a wife is only half a man. Now and then we find a woman in the world who is styled an "old maid;" but a woman without a husband is only half a humanity. Adam, in the beginning, was a perfect humanity, possessing the strength, dignity and courage of man, with the grace, gentleness and beauty of woman. After Eve's creation he retained the strength, dignity and courage; but lost with Eve, the grace, beauty and gentleness; so that it now takes the union of one man, with the sterner qualities, with one woman, with the gentler graces, to produce one perfect humanity, and that is the type of marriage, as instituted by Almighty God, and as is approved by His divine law.

And, now, I desire to run the parallel between the two systems, showing how the one is destructive of the other. Take, for instance, the element, namely, the design, and see how polygamy strikes at the institution of marriage in that regard. I now refer to companionship, the union of two loving hearts to the exclusion of a third. A man may love three or more friends; he may love three or more children; he may love three or more brothers or sisters; but God

has so ordained the law of affinities between the man and the woman that companionship can only be secured to the exclusion of a third person. Ah! what a pleasure it is for a man when away from home to know, "I shall soon return to the bosom of my wife, and my little children will climb upon my knee and lisp the child's welcome at my return." And he hastens from afar to the embraces of that wife. And then what an almost infinity of joy it is on the part of the woman, whose husband is far away, to know that he is coming. Says she, "I will stand in the door-way and will watch his returning footsteps. He is coming to me, to my embrace, to my home prepared for him!" And with what pride and care the busy housewife arranges for his return! How neat and beautiful everything is! The bouquet of flowers is on the table, the best viands are spread on the board, and everything in the house is prepared with the utmost care! But oh! what a gloom comes down upon the poor woman's soul when she knows that he returns not to her, but returns to one, two, three, four, twelve, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty.

Then see how the system works against the next design—namely, procreation. It is a fact that in polygamous countries one sex or the other has preponderance in numbers. Some good authorities say the females preponderate, others say the males. I do not know, I do not care a rush which preponderates; all that I say is this, that good, reliable authorities say that in polygamic—mark you, polygamic countries, there is a preponderance of one or the other; while in monogamic nations the great law of equality is brought out. According to some authorities the tendency of polygamy is to make all males; according to other authorities to make all females; and if either follow then comes the destruction of the race, and within a hundred years the earth is depopulated and is a howling wilderness.

Take the influence of polygamy upon what may be properly called the rights of marriage, and these rights are two-fold:—authority on the part of the man, and protection on the part of the woman. The man is the head of the family; the man is the high priest of the family; the man is the legislator and executive of the family. He is to have reverence from his wife; she is to obey him; and I never performed the marriage ceremony without including that word when I address the woman: "Wilt thou obey the man?" That is God's authority, and every true and loving wife will obey her husband in the Lord as readily as she obeys the Lord Jesus Christ. But while man is the legislator and executive; while he is endowed with authority as his right, so, on the other hand, protection belongs to and is the natural and inalienable right of the woman. See that ivy as it entwines around the oak! That grand old oak has sent down its roots and takes hold of the very foundations of the earth, and its branches tower up towards the sky. See that ivy how it entwines itself gently, sweetly and beautifully around the oak!

"A thing of beauty is a joy for ever."

So woman entwines herself, the tendrils of her affection go out and they entwine themselves around the man; and what must be

the depth of the depravity to which that man has fallen who ruthlessly tears asunder these gentle tendrils of affection! What the ivy is to the oak, the woman is to the man; and it is for man, in his pride and glory, in his strength and energy, with his strong arm to protect her; and it is woman's right to go to man for protection. But how is it possible under the system of polygamy for these great rights to be preserved? It is true that the man retains his right and authority; this system augments and multiplies that authority. This system is one of usurpation, extending a right over the larger number that is not included in God's law. But, on the other hand, where is the right of woman for protection? A whole soul for a whole soul! A whole body for a whole body, and a whole life for a whole life! Just like the shells of the bivalve; they correspond with each other! Just like the two wings of a bird, male and female. So precisely this great idea of reciprocity, mutual affection and reciprocal love is developed in this idea of monogamous marriage. But polygamy, it seems to me, strikes down this right of woman; in other words, it divides the protecting power of man in proportion to the number of wives he possesses; and it seems to me that in view of the distribution of worldly goods in this life a man can support and protect but one family. Kings, who can tax a whole people; kings, who can build palaces and rear pyramids; kings, who can marshal their armies on the banks of the Rhine and go to war, may have their harems—their plurality of wives; but the poor man, doomed to toil, with the sweat of labor on his brow, how is it possible for him to provide for more than one family? Yet if the king in his glory has the right to have a plurality of wives, so also has the poor man, who is doomed to toil, the same right; and God Almighty, in making this law for a plurality of wives, if he has made it, which I, of course, question, yet, if he has made it, then he has not made provision for the execution of that law; or, in other words, he has not made provision for its immunities to be enjoyed by the common people. It is a law exclusively for nabobs, kings and high priests; for men in power, for men possessing wealth, and not for me, a poor man, or for you [pointing to audience] a poor laborer. God Almighty is just, and a king is no more before him than a peasant. The meanest of his creatures, as well as the highest, are all alike unto him. I ask, you, therefore, to-day, would he enact a law sanctioning—commanding a plurality of wives, without making a provision that every man should be in such financial circumstances as to have a plurality of wives and enjoy them? See, therefore, how these two systems of marriage are antagonistic one against the other! And, after hearing this exposition of the nature and the elements and the rights and the muniments of marriage, it is for you to infer which is the system which God ordained in the beginning.

My distinguished friend has hastily reviewed many passages of Scripture, all of which, my friends, I shall notice. I will sift them to the bottom. My only regret is that my distinguished friend, for whose scholarship I have regard, did not deliberately take up one passage and exhaust that passage, instead of giving us here a pas-

sage and there a passage, simply skimming them over without going to the depths, and showing their philological relation and their entire practical bearing upon us. When my friend shall give us such an exegesis and analysis, whether he quotes Hebrew, Greek or Latin, I will promise him that I will follow him through all the mazes of his exposition and I will go down to the very bottom of his argument.

I feel bound, to-day, my friends, in my opening speech to give this analysis of the question and to present to you my ideas of marriage in contradistinction to the idea of marriage held here as polygamous.

Now I presume that I will pass to the consideration of a few of the salient points which my distinguished friend threw out.

Let us see in relation to the text he quoted, "If brethren dwell together," though he wanders back and it was difficult for me to see what relation the antediluvians, and what relation old Adam had to this passage; but he referred to the antediluvians and to Adam, and he also referred to Lamech. Who was Lamech? He is the first polygamist on record, the first mentioned in the first two hundred years of the history of the world. He had two wives; and what else did he have? He had murder in his heart and blood on his hand, and I aver that whoever analyzes the case of Lamech, will find that the murder which he committed grew out of his plurality of wives; in other words it grew out of the polygamy which he attempted to introduce into the world. Said he to his wives, "I have slain a man;" and the inference is that this man had come to claim his rights.

My friend says that Cain was a murderer, and went down to the land of Nod: he don't exactly know the geography, but it was somewhere. And there he found a woman and married her. Now I affirm this, that when Cain killed his brother Abel he was not married, and he didn't go down to the land of Nod, then, therefore the murder he committed didn't grow out of monogamy, and seems to have had no relation to monogamy; but it grew out of this fact: these two brothers came before the Lord to present their offerings. Cain was a deist, a moralist as we may say, that is, he had no sins to repent of. He therefore did not bring the little lamb as a sacrificial offering, but he came with the first fruits of the earth as a thank offering. He comes before God Almighty and says: "I have no sins to atone for, none at all: but here, I am conscious that thou hast created me and that I am dependent upon thee, therefore I present to thee the first fruits of the soil." Abel comes with his thank offering. He brings his lamb and lays it upon the altar, and that lamb pre-intimated the coming of Jesus Christ, who is "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world:" and if there is any record that Abel brought a thank offering, it is a principle in theology and scriptural exposition that the whole includes the part, just as Saint Paul says: "I beseech you, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice to God." Do you think that he excluded the soul? No, he speaks of one as including the other. So the offering which Abel presented was an offering, sacrificial in

its nature, pointing to Christ. Now, perhaps by sending down fire from heaven, or at all events in some significant manner, God recognized the righteousness of Abel, and expressed a preference for his offering, and Cain was wroth, and his pride belched forth and he slew his brother. The murder, therefore, had no reference, directly or indirectly, to marriage, while the murder which the first polygamist mentioned in history committed grew out of the marriage relation.

Then my friend goes back to Adam, and says our first parents wore clothes made of skins, and therefore we must wear similar ones. Well, let us see. Our first parents were placed in a garden and were driven out of a garden, therefore we must be placed in a garden and driven out of a garden. The first man was created out of the dust of the earth, therefore all subsequent men must be created out of the same material. The first woman was created out of man's rib, therefore all subsequent women must be made so. They would make very nice women, no doubt about that! Such is the logic of my friend! So you may follow on his absurdities. He has failed to make a distinction between what is essential to marriage and what is accidental to marriage; or in other words, he has failed to make a distinction between the creation and the fall of man, and between the institution and characteristics of marriage. One, therefore, is surprised at such arguments, and drawn from such premises!

Now, my friends, that first marriage in the garden of Eden is the great model for all subsequent marriages: one man and one woman. My friend says that God could have made more if he had chosen; but he did not do so, and it seems to me, if God Almighty had designed that all us men should be polygamists, and that polygamy should be the form of marriage, that in the very beginning he would have started right, that is, he would have made a number of women for the first man. Ah! what a grand sanction that would be; but instead of that he makes one man and one woman, and says—"For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh."

This is not merely an historical fact; were it so I think the argument would be with my friend. But as I come along the stream of time I find this fact referred to as expressing a great law. I hear old Malachi repeating the same words, referring to this institution of marriage in the garden of Eden, reproving the Jews for their practice of polygamy, putting the pungent question to their conscience—"Why have ye dealt treacherously with the wife of your youth?"—your first wife, the one with whom you went to the bridal altar and swore before high Heaven that you would forsake all others and cleave unto her so long as you both live. "Ah!" that old prophet asks, "why have you dealt thus treacherously with the wife of your youth and the wife of your covenant?" God hates this putting away, says the prophet, and then he refers to Eden as a reason for his reproof. The reason is purely monogamous, and that in the beginning God created one woman for one man, and one man for one woman.

When the Pharisees propounded a question to the Lord Jesus Christ, touching divorce, he refers to the same grand idea spoken of by the Prophet Malachi: "Have ye not read that in the beginning God created them male and female?" Thus re-enacting, as it were, the marriage law; thus lifting marriage, which had been stained by polygamy, from its degradation, and re-establishing it in its monogamic purity. And then St. Paul, corroborating the words of Jesus, [at this time the umpires said the time was up] refers to the marriage in Eden, and says, "God created them, male and female, one flesh." This is the great truth brought out in the Bible.

---

## SECOND DAY.

---

After opening with religious exercise: Prof. Pratt commenced:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We again come before you this afternoon, being the second session of our discussion, to examine the question: "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I will here remark, that yesterday afternoon I occupied one hour upon the subject, and brought forth numerous evidences from the Bible to show that polygamy was a divine institution sanctioned by the Bible, and sanctioned by the Almighty, who gave the laws contained in the Bible. Here let me observe that it is of the utmost importance to clearly understand the point under discussion. I perceive that in the arguments that followed me yesterday the subject is dwelt upon somewhat lengthily with regard to the meaning of the term polygamy—that it included both a plurality of wives and a plurality of husbands. Hence a new term was introduced by the reverend Doctor, who followed me, namely polygyny, if I recollect the term, having reference to the plurality of wives. This seems to be the question under discussion: Does the Bible sanction Polygamy? and as the word polygamy appears to be discarded and scouted, it would be: Does the Bible sanction Polygyny? or, Does the Bible sanction plurality of wives? The first remark to which I will call your attention is in regard to the original of the Bible. I admit in this discussion the Bible called King James' translation as authority. I admit the Bible in the original Hebrew, if it can be found. Of course we have Hebrew Bibles at the present day. I hold one in my hand; this is a Bible in the Hebrew language. But there is no such thing in existence as the original copies of the Bible; neither secondary copies; and copies that might come in as the hundredth copy, I presume, cannot be found, as, for instance, a copy of the original law of Moses, written on tables of stone. Such tables and such original law have not been in existence to our knowledge for the last eighteen hundred years.



We cannot refer to them ; we cannot refer to any copies only those that have been multiplied in modern times—that is, comparatively modern times. And inasmuch as these copies disagree one with the other, so much so that it is said there are thirty thousand different readings in the various manuscripts and copies, who is to decide whether this Hebrew Bible, translated from one of a number of manuscripts, is translated from the original or not? Certainly it would not do for me as an individual to set up my judgment in the matter ; nor for any other learned man to set up his judgment. I would far rather take the translation known as King James', made by the able translators chosen in his day ; men of great learning, who had studied the original languages, the Hebrew and the Greek, and had become extensively acquainted with manuscripts in existence ; I say I would far rather take their judgment than one that might be advanced by myself, or by any other learned man, however deeply he might be versed in the Hebrew or Greek. I do not by these remarks disparage the Bible, or set it aside. I accept it as proof that it was translated by those men who were chosen for the purpose. And hundreds of thousands, I may say scores of millions, of copies of this Bible have been circulated among all nations in various languages. They have been sent forth by millions among the inhabitants of the earth for their information.

We will pass along after having decided upon the nature of the Bible that is to be admitted as evidence and proof in regard to polygamy. It was stated in the course of the remarks of the reverend gentleman in relation to polygamy, or polygyny, whichever term we feel disposed to choose, that marriage with more than one woman is considered adultery. I will read one or two of Mr. Newman's sentences. "Take his exposition"—that is the Savior's—"Take his exposition of the ten commandments as they were given amid the thunders of Mount Sinai, and you find he has written a commentary on the Decalogue, bringing out its hidden meaning, showing to us that the man is an adulterer who not only marries more women than one, but who looks on a woman with salacious lust. Such is the commentary on the law by the Lord Jesus Christ."

With part of this I agree most perfectly. If a man, according to the great commentary of our Savior, looks upon a woman with a lustful heart and lustful desire, he commits adultery in his heart, and is condemned as an adulterer. With the other part I do most distinctly disagree. It is merely an assertion of the reverend gentleman. No proof was adduced from the New Testament Scriptures ; no proof was advanced as the words of the great commentator, the Lord Jesus Christ, to establish the position that a man who marries more than one woman is an adulterer. If there is such a passage contained within the lids of the New Testament, it has not come under my observation. It remains to be proved, therefore.

We will now pass on to another item, that is, the meaning of the word "sanction :—" "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I am willing to admit the full force and meaning of the word sanction. I am willing to take it in all of its expositions as set forth in Webster's unabridged edition. I do not feel like shirking from this, nor

from the definition given. Let it stand in all its force. "The only adequate idea of sanction," says Mr. Newman, "is the divine and positive approbation, plainly expressed : " or stated so definitely and by such forms of expression as to make a full and clear equivalent. It is in this way that we take the term sanction in the question before us. Admit that it must be expressed in definite terms, these terms were laid before the congregation yesterday afternoon. From this Bible, King James' translation, passage after passage was brought forth to prove the divine sanction of polygamy ; direct commands in several instances, wherein the Israelites were required to be polygamists ; and in one instance, especially, where they were required under the heaviest curse of the Lord, "Cursed be he that continueth not in all things written in this book of the law ; and let all the people say Amen," was the expression. I say, under this dreadful curse and the denunciations of the Almighty, the people were commanded to be polygamists. Did this give authority and sanction to practise that divine institution ? It certainly is sanction, or I do not understand the meaning of the word as defined by Webster, and the meaning of the arguments presented by my opponent. I waited in vain yesterday afternoon for any rebutting evidence and testimony against this divine sanction. I was ready with my pencil and paper to record anything like such evidence, any passage from the Bible to prove that it was not sanctioned. I heard a remarkable sermon, a wonderful flourish of oratory. It certainly was pleasing to my ears. It fell upon me like the dews of heaven, as it were, so far as oratorical power was concerned. But where was the rebutting testimony ? What was the evidence brought forth ? Forty-nine minutes of the time were occupied before it was even referred to ; forty-nine minutes passed away in a flourish of oratory, without having the proofs in rebuttal and the evidence examined which I had adduced. Then eleven minutes were left. I did expect to hear something in those eleven minutes that would in some small degree rebut the numerous evidences brought forth to establish and sanction polygamy. But I waited in vain. To be sure, one passage, and only one that had been cited, in Deuteronomy, was merely referred to ; and then, without examining the passage and trying to show that it did not command polygamy, another item that was referred to by myself with regard to Lamech and Cain was brought up. Instead of an examination of that passage, until the close of the eleven minutes, the subject of Abel's sacrifice and Cain's sacrifice, and Cain's going to the land of Nod and marrying a wife, and so on, occupied the time. All these things were examined, and those testimonies that were brought forth by me were untouched.

Now, then, we will proceed to the fourth, or rather to the fifth position he took : that is the first great form of marriage established in the beginning—"one woman created for one man." However, before I dwell upon this subject, let me make a correction with regard to Cain and Lamech ; then we will commence on this argument. I did not state yesterday afternoon, as it was represented by the speaker who followed me, that Cain went to the Land of Nod and there married a wife, for there is no such thing in the Bible. I

stated that Cain went to the land of Nod, after having murdered his brother Abel. I stated that we were not to suppose that God had created any woman in the land of Nod, or that Cain took his wife in the land of Nod. We are not to suppose this; but we are to suppose that he took his wife with him. He went to and arrived in the land of Nod, and begat a child. So says the Bible. But what has all this to do with regard to the form of marriage? Does it prove anything? No. The murder that Cain committed in slaying his brother Abel does not prove anything against the monogamic form of marriage, nor anything in favor of it. It stands as an isolated fact, showing that a wicked man may be a monogamist. How in regard to Lamech? Lamech, so far as recorded in the Bible, was the first polygamist; the first on record. There may have been thousands and tens of thousands who were not recorded. There were thousands and tens of thousands of monogamists, yet, I believe, we have only three cases recorded from the creation to the flood, a period of some sixteen hundred years or upwards. The silence of Scripture, therefore, in regard to the number of polygamists in that day, is no evidence whatever.

But it has been asserted before this congregation that this first case recorded of a polygamist brought in connection with it a murder: and it has been indicated or inferred that the murder so committed was in defence of polygamy. This I deny; and I called upon the gentleman to bring forth one proof from that Bible, from the beginning to the end of it, to prove that murder had anything to do in relation to the polygamic form of marriage of Lamech. It is true he revealed his crime to his wives, but the cause of the crime is not stated in the book. What, then, had it to do with the divinity of the great institution established called polygamy? Nothing at all. It does not condemn polygamy nor justify it, any more than the murder by Cain condemns or justifies the other form of marriage.

Having disposed of these two cases, let me come to the first monogamist, Adam. Let us examine his character, and the character of his wife. Lamech "slew a young man to his wounding, a young man to his hurt." That was killing one, was it not? How many did Adam kill? All mankind; murdered the whole human race. How? by falling in the garden of Eden. Would mankind have died if it had not been for the sin of this monogamist? No. Paul says "that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." It was by the transgression of the first monogamist and his monogamic wife, that all mankind have to undergo the penalty of death. It was the cause, and I presume it will be acknowledged on the part even of monogamists that it was a great crime. What can be compared with it? Was Cain's crime, or Lamech's crime to be compared with the crime of bringing death and destruction, not only upon the people of the early ages, but upon the whole human race? But what has all that to do with regard to the divinity of marriage? Nothing at all. It does not prove one thing or the other. But when arguments of this kind are entered into by the opponents of polygamy, it is well enough to examine them and

see if they will stand the test of Scripture, and sound reason, of sound argument and sound judgment. Moreover, Adam was not only guilty of bringing death and destruction upon the whole human race, but he was the means of introducing fallen humanity into this world of ours. Why did Cain slay Abel? Because he was a descendant of that fallen being. He had come forth from the loins of the man who had brought death into the world. When we look abroad and see all the various crimes, as well as murder, that exist on the face of the globe, when we see mankind committing them; see all manner of degradation and lust; see the human family destroying one another, the question might rise, What has produced all these evils among men? They exist because a monogamic couple transgressed the law of heaven.

The learned gentleman referred us to a saying of that great man Martin Luther, concerning the relationship that exists between husband and wife. It was a beautiful argument. I have no fault whatever to find with it. And it is just as applicable to polygamy as to monogamy. The answer of Martin Luther to the question put to him—Why God took the female from the side of man, is just as appropriate, just as consistent with the plural form of marriage as it is with the other form. He did not take the woman from the head. Why? The argument was that the man should be the head, or as Paul says—"Man is the head of the woman," and that is his position. I believe my learned opponent agrees with me perfectly in this, so there is no dispute upon this ground. Why did not he take the woman from the foot. Because man is not to tyrannize over his wife, nor tread her under foot. Why did he take her from his side? Because the rib lies nearest the heart, showing the position of woman. Not only one woman but two women, five women, ten women, twenty women, forty women, fifty women, may all come under the protecting head. Jesus says: "No man can serve two masters," because he may love the one and hate the other, cleave unto the one and turn away from the other; but it is not so with women under the protecting head.

Now let us examine polyandry, for that was referred to yesterday; and the reverend gentleman could not see why, if a man has the privilege of taking more wives than one, a woman should not have the same privilege. If that is expressed in the Bible we have not found it; the other is expressed there, and we have proved it, and call upon the reverend gentleman to show the opposite. When we come to polyandry, or the woman having more husbands than one, there is no sanction for it in the Scriptures. What is the object of marriage? Companionship, we are told. I agree with the gentleman. Another object he says is procreation. I agree with the gentleman also in the second object. Another was prevention. Here I agree with him so far as the argument is carried out in a true light. Let us examine the second, namely procreation. The Lord instituted marriage—the sacred bond of marriage—for the purpose of multiplying the human species here on the earth. Does polyandry assist in the multiplying of the human species, the woman having four, or five, or ten, or fifty, or sixty husbands?

Does it tend to rapidly increase the race? I think monogamists as well as polygamists, when they reflect, will say that a woman having more than one husband would destroy her own fruitfulness. Even if she did have offspring, there would be another great difficulty in the way, the father would be unknown. Would it not be so? All knowledge of the father would be lost among the children. Is this the case with a plurality of wives? No. If a man have fifty wives the knowledge of the father is as distinct as the knowledge of the mother. It is not destroyed, therefore. The great principle of parentage on the part of the husband, on the part of the father is preserved. Therefore it is more consistent, more reasonable, first for procreation, and secondly for obtaining a knowledge of parentage, that a man should have a plurality of wives than that a woman should have a plurality of husbands.

Again: a man with a plurality of wives is capable of raising up a very numerous household. You know what the Scriptures have said about children: "Children are the heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward." This being the case, a faithful, righteous, holy man, who takes, according to the great, divine institution of polygamy, a plurality of wives, is capable of multiplying his offspring ten or twenty-fold more than he could by one wife. Can one wife do this by polyandry? No. Here then is a great distinction between the male and the female. Look at that great and good and holy man, called Gideon in the Scriptures; a man to whom the angel of God was sent, and who, among all the hosts of Israel was chosen to go forth as the servant of the Most High. For what purpose? To deliver Israel from their enemies, the Midianites and others that had gathered against them. Was he a polygamist? Yes. Had he many wives? He had seventy-two sons. How many daughters he had I do not know. Could any woman in polyandry conceive or bring forth seventy-two sons and perhaps an equal number of daughters? I do not know but there might be some efficacy in that herb called "mandrake," or in some other miraculous herb that would give power and strength for one woman to bring forth seventy-two sons. Who knows, in a day of wonders like this! But a man has the ability, a man has the power to beget large families and large households. Hence we read of many of the great and notable men who judged Israel; one man had thirty sons—his name was Jair; you will find it recorded in the Judges of Israel; and another had thirty sons and thirty daughters; while another Judge of Israel had forty sons. And when we come to the Gideon we have named, he had seventy-two. Now, we have nothing to do with the righteousness of these men, or their unrighteousness, in this connection. That has nothing to do with the marriage institution. God has established it by divine command. God has given it his own sanction, whether it be the polygamic or the monogamic form. If Gideon afterwards fell into idolatry, as the reverend gentleman may argue, that has nothing to do with the matter. He had the power to beget seventy-two sons, showing he had a superior power to that of the female.

Right here, I may say, God is a consistent being; a being who is perfectly consistent, and who delights in the salvation of the human family. A wicked man may take unto himself a wife, and raise unto himself a posterity. He may set before that wife and her posterity a very wicked example. He may lead those children by his drunkenness, by his blasphemy, by his immoralities, down to destruction. A righteous man may take fifty wives, or ten, as you choose; and he will bring up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; he will instruct them in the great principles of righteousness and truth, and lead them along and bring them up by his example and by his teachings to inherit eternal life at the right hand of God, with those polygamists of ancient times, Abraham and Jacob of old, who are up yonder in the Kingdom of God. Which of the two is the Lord most pleased with? The man who has five, or ten, or twenty wives, bringing up his children, teaching them, instructing them, training them so that they may obtain eternal life with the righteous in the Kingdom of God; or the monogamist that brings up his children in all manner of wickedness, and finally leads them down to hell? Which would you prefer with your limited wisdom when compared with that of the great Creator? Who among you would not prefer to entrust your offspring with your friends instead of your enemies? Would not God, therefore, upon the same principle do the same? Does God delight in the marriages that exist among the wicked? Go to the antediluvian race. They married and were given in marriage until the day that Noah entered into the ark. They were not righteous men nor righteous women; and their children were taught in the wicked precepts of their fathers, who committed all manner of wickedness until all flesh had corrupted itself before the Lord. Therefore the Lord had to destroy those evil workers of iniquity that had received wives, but did not honor nor regard the Lord. Instead of those marriages consummated immediately before the flood, the marriages and intermarriages among the sons and the daughters of men, being acceptable to the Most High, he was obliged to destroy those that were married and their offspring from the face of the earth. How much better it would have been had they been righteous polygamists, who would have brought forth a pure offspring that the Lord could have exalted to eternal life. Consequently, when we examine the subject of polygamy in regard to this matter, we must acknowledge, from these Scriptures, and from various other testimonies, that the marriages of the wicked are not approved by the Heavens. There are many passages of scripture to support me in what I have now said. The Lord in one place commands the destruction of a people, parents and children, "lest they should fill the world with cities," lest all the world should be filled with people who had married contrary to his law. No person can pretend that a marriage consummated between an unrighteous man and an unrighteous woman, is a marriage in which God has joined the parties together. You might as well take the ordinance of baptism, and say that Simon Magus, when he went forward and was baptized had complied with the ordinance of Heaven, while he

yet remained in a condition of hardened sinfulness ; and that because he had passed through the outward observance of the ordinance it was acceptable in the sight of Heaven. God never had anything to do with the marriages of the wicked only to permit them, perhaps for a wise purpose, as he permitted Joseph to be sold into Egypt by his brethren. He permitted the deed for his own wise purposes, but he did not justify the instruments who did the deed. So he permits these unauthorized marriages between wicked men and wicked women, to perpetuate the human race, because they will not hearken to him, until the time shall come when he can have a pure people who will obey his laws, educating their posterity to honor and serve him. He permits, but he does not sanction such marriages.

If we should argue with the reverend gentleman that the census shows an equality of males and females, this argument that I have now advanced will rebut the idea thus sought to be established. The idea is that because there may be made to appear an equality in numbers, therefore, every man must be confined to one wife and every woman must have one husband. Is that the way God dispenses his gifts and blessings to the human family ? Does he give the same amount of blessings to the wicked that he does to the righteous ? In some respects he does. He sends the rain from Heaven upon the just and the unjust. But there are many great and important blessings that are bestowed more abundantly upon the righteous than upon the wicked. God has holy designs to accomplish when he makes a distinction between the righteous and the wicked in dispensing his blessings. Therefore if the wicked take wives without their being joined together by divine authority, those wives have allied themselves to their husbands without the Lord's sanction. Because the Lord permits this, it does not prove that he sanctions it ; and he would prefer that the people should be like Israel of old, a nation of polygamists as well as monogamists, and the blessings be dispensed between them, rather than have this so-called perfect equality between the males and females, and a wicked generation be the result. To prove this I will refer you to the 37th Psalm. God in that Psalm has expressly said, and repeated again and again, that the seed of the evil-doers should be rooted out of the earth, while the righteous should inherit it and should prosper. He bestows his blessings upon the one and his curses upon the other.

I shall expect this afternoon to hear some arguments to refute those passages brought forward to sustain polygamy as well as monogamy ; and if the gentleman can find no proof to limit the passages I have quoted to monogamic households, if there is no such evidence contained in the passages, and there is nothing in the original Hebrew as it now exists to invalidate them, then polygamy as a divine institution stands as firm as the throne of the Almighty. And if he can find that this form of marriage is repealed in the New Testament ; if he can find that God has in any age of the world done away with the principle and form of plural marriage, perhaps the argument will rest with the other side. I shall

wait with great patience to have some arguments brought forth on this subject. We are happy, here in this Territory, to have the learned come among us to teach us. We have embraced the Bible as a rule of faith; and if we misunderstand it, if we are acting contrary to its precepts, how very happy we should be to have the learned come from abroad—people who are acquainted with the original languages—to correct us and set us right. I think this is generous on the part of those gentlemen; much more so than it would be to enact laws and incarcerate in dungeons those who practise a form of marriage laid down in this book; to send them for three, or four, or five years to prison, tearing them from their poor wives and children, while their families would suffer hardship and hunger, being robbed of their natural protectors. We thank Mr. Newman and those who have come with him with their hearts full of philanthropy to enlighten us here in this mountain Territory, and if possible convince us of our errors.

I have many arguments that I have not drawn upon, not only to reason upon, but testimonies as well in favor of polygamy; but I am informed that only seven minutes of the time remains to me. I cannot, therefore, pretend on this occasion to enter into these arguments and examine them with that justice that should be expected before the people. Mr. Newman has said he would like nine hours to bring forth his arguments and his reasonings for the benefit of the poor people of Utah. I wish he would not only take nine hours, but nine weeks and nine months, and be indeed a philanthropist and missionary in our midst; and try and reclaim this poor people from being the "awful beastly" people they are represented abroad. We are very fond of the Scriptures. We do not feel free to comply with a great many customs and characteristics of a great many of those who call themselves Christians. Much may be said upon this subject; much, too, that ought to crimson the faces of those who call themselves civilized, when they reflect upon the enormities, the great social evils, that exist in their midst. Look at the great city of New York, the great metropolis of commerce. That is a city where we might expect some of the most powerful and learned theologians to hold forth, teaching and inculcating principles and lessons of Christianity. What exists in the midst of that city? Females by the tens of thousands, females who are debauched by day and by night; females who are in open day parading the streets of that great city! Why, they are monogamists there! It is a portion of the civilization of New York to be very pious over polygamy; yet harlots and mistresses by the thousands and tens of thousands walk the streets by open day, as well as by night. There is sin enough committed there in one twenty-four hours to sink the city down like Sodom and Gomorrah.

We read that there was once a case of prostitution among the children of Benjamin in ancient days. Some men came and took another man's wife, or concubine, whichever you please to call her; some men took her and abused her all night; and for that one sin they were called to account. They were called upon to deliver up the offenders but they would not do it, and they were viewed as



confederates. And what was the result of that one little crime—not a little crime—a great one; that one crime instead of thousands? The Lord God said to the rest of the tribes of Israel, Go forth and fight against the tribe of Benjamin. They fought against Benjamin; and the next day they were again commanded to go forth and fight against Benjamin. They obeyed; and the next day they were again so commanded; and they fought until they cut off the entire tribe except six hundred men. The destruction of nearly the whole tribe of Benjamin was the punishment for one act of prostitution.

Compare the strictness that existed in ancient Israel with the whoredoms, the prostitution and even the infanticide practised in all the cities of this great nation; and then because a few individuals in this mountain Territory are practising Bible marriage a law must be enacted to inflict heavy penalties upon us; our families must be torn from us and be driven to misery, because of the piety of a civilization in which the enormities I have pointed out exist.

To close this argument I now call upon the reverend gentleman, whom I highly respect for his learning, his eloquence and ability, to bring forth proof to rebut the passages laid down in yesterday's argument in support of the position that the Bible sanctions polygamy. I ask him to prove that those laws were limited, to unmarried men, or to the monogamic form of marriage only.

(Here the umpires announced that the time was up.)

---

## DR. NEWMAN Rose and Said:

MESSRS. UMPIRES AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I understand the gentleman to complain against me that I did not answer his Scriptural arguments adduced yesterday. If I did not the responsibility is upon him. He, being in the affirmative, should have analyzed and defined the question under debate; but he failed to do that. It therefore fell to me, not by right, but by his neglecting to do his duty; and I did it to the best of my ability. It was of the utmost importance that this audience, so attentive and so respectable, should have a clear and definite understanding of the terms of the question; and I desire now to inform the gentleman, that I had the answers before me to the passages which he adduced, and had I had another hour, I would have produced them then. I will do it to-day. Now, my learned friend will take out his pencil, for he will have something to do this afternoon.

A passing remark—a word in regard to the original manuscripts, written by Moses, or Joshua, or Samuel, or the prophets. You sit down to write a letter to a friend; you take it into your head to copy that letter; you copy that letter; the original draft you care nothing about—whether it is given to the winds or the flames. What care I about the two tables of stone on which the

original law was written, so that I have a true copy of this law? A passing remark in regard to Mother Eve. I will defend the venerable woman! If the Fall came by the influence of one woman over one man, what would have happened to the world if Adam had had more wives than one? More, if one woman, under monogamy, brought woe into the world, then a monogamist, the blessed Virgin Mary, brought the Redeemer into the world, so I think they are even.

My friend supposes that the Almighty might have created more women than one out of Adam's ribs; but Adam had not ribs enough to create fifty women. My friend speaks against polyandry, or the right of women to have more husbands than one. He bases his argument upon the increase of progeny. Science affirms that where polygamy or polygyny, or a plurality of wives prevails, there is a tendency to a preponderance or predominance of one sex over the other, either male or female, which amounts to an extermination of the race.

I will reply, in due time, to the gentleman's remarks in regard to Gideon and other Scriptural characters, and especially in regard to prostitution, or what is known as the social evil. But first, what was the object of the gentleman yesterday? It was to discover a general law for the sanction of polygamy. Did he find that law? I deny it. What is law? Law is the expression of the legislative will; law is the manner in which an act is performed. It is the law of gravitation that all things tend to common centre. It is the law in botany that the flowers open their fan-like leaves to the light, and close them beneath the kisses of night. What is the civil law? Simply defining how the citizens should act. What is the moral law? Simply defining the conduct of God's moral subjects. Laws are mandatory, prohibitory and permissive: commanding what should be done; prohibiting what should not be done, and permitting what may be done. And, yet, where has the gentleman produced this general law which he spent an hour in searching for yesterday? And then remember, that this law must sanction polygamy! Perhaps it is not necessary to repeat our definition of the word "sanction." My learned friend, for whom I have respect, agrees with me as to the definition of that term, therefore we need not spend a solitary moment further touching these two points.

There is another vital point in reference to the nature of law. In legislating upon any subject there must be a great, organic central principle, mandatory or prohibitory, in reference to that subject; and all other parts of the particular law as well as of the general code must be interpreted in harmony therewith.

Now I propose to produce a law this afternoon, simple, direct and positive, that polygamy is forbidden in God's holy word. In Leviticus xviii. and 18th, it is written: "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time." There is a law in condemnation of polygamy. It may be said that what I have read is as it reads in the margin, but that in the body of the text it reads: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness,

besides the other in her life time." Very well, *argumentum ad hominem*, I draw my argument from the speech of the gentleman yesterday. Mr. Pratt said, in his comments upon the text, "If brethren dwell together."—Now it is well enough in the reading of this to refer to the margin, as we have the liberty, I believe, to do so, and you will find that in the margin the word brother is translated "near kinsmen." I accept this mode of reasoning; he refers to the margin, and I refer to the margin; it is a poor rule that will not work both ways; it is a poor rule that will not favor monogamy if it favor polygamy. Such then is the fact stated in this law.

Now it is necessary for us to consider the nature of this law; and to expound it to your understanding, it may be proper for me to say that this interpretation, as given in the margin, is sustained by the most eminent biblical and classical scholars in the history of Christendom—by Bishop Jewell, by the learned Cookson, by the eminent Dwight, and other distinguished biblical scholars. It is an accepted canon of interpretation that the scope of the law must be considered in determining the sense of any portion of the law, and it is equally binding upon us to ascertain the mind of the legislator, from the preface of the law, when such preface is given. The first few verses of the xviii. chapter of Leviticus are prefatory. In the 3rd verse it is stated that—

After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances.

Both the Egyptians and the Canaanites practised incest, idolatry, sodomy, adultery and polygamy. From verse 6 to verse 17, inclusive, the law of consanguinity is laid down, and the blood relationship defined. Then the limits within which persons were forbidden to marry, and in verse 18 the law against polygamy is given—"neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister," but as we have given it, "neither shalt thou take one wife to another," etc.

According to Dr. Edwards, the words which are translated a "wife" or "sister," are found in the Hebrew but eight times, and in each passage they refer to inanimate objects, such as the wings of the cherubim, tenons, mortises, etc., and signify the coupling together one to another, the same as thou shalt not take one wife to another.

Such then is the law. Such were the ordinances forbidden, which the Egyptians and the Canaanites practised. Now we propose to push this argument a little further. If it is said that this passage does not prohibit a man marrying two sisters at the same time, then such a marriage is nowhere in the Bible pronounced incestuous. That is the objection of my friend. To which I reply that such a marriage is forbidden by sequence and analogy. As for example, where the son, in the 7th verse, is prohibited from marrying his mother, it follows that the daughter shall not marry her father; yet it is not so given and precisely stated. In verse 14 it is said—"thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother;" so I infer that it would be equally criminal to uncover the nakedness of a mother's brother, though it is not so stated. In verse 16 it is said—

“thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother’s wife,” so I infer that a man shall not uncover the nakedness of his wife’s sister, that is, if two brothers shall not take the same woman, then two women shall not take the same man, for between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers is the same degree of proximity, and therefore both are forbidden by the law of God. Furthermore, if for argument’s sake, we consider this means two literal sisters, then this prohibition is not a permission for a man to take two wives who are not sisters; for all sound jurists will agree that a prohibition is one thing and a permission is another thing. Nay, more, the Mormons do or do not receive the law of Moses as binding. That they do not is clear from their own practices. For instance, in Leviticus, xx chap. and 14 verse it is said—

And if a man take a wife and her mother, it is wickedness; they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they.

Yet Mr. John Hyde, jr., page 56 of his work called “Mormonism,” states that a Mr. E. Bolton married a woman and her daughter: that Captain Brown married a woman and her two daughters.

These are illustrations of the violation of the law. More than this, Leviticus xviii, 18, prohibits a man from marrying two sisters; yet Mr. Hyde informs us that a Mr. Davis married three sisters, and a Mr. Sharkey married the same number. If the question is, Is the law of Moses obeyed here or not? and supposing this gentleman can prove that the text means two literal sisters, and two literal sisters are married here, then I affirm that you do not keep God’s law, or that which you say is God’s law, as given through his servant Moses. Nay, more than this: if it here means two literal sisters, and whereas, Jacob married two sisters: and, whereas, the great Mormon doctrine that God worked a miracle on Leah and Rachel that they might have children; and, whereas, it is here said that said miracles were an approval of polygamy, so also were such miracles an approval of incest; if it be true that God did not express this approval at Jacob having two wives, neither did he express disapproval of his having two sisters; therefore the Divine silence in the one case is an offset to the Divine silence in the other case. Even you are driven to this conclusion, either my interpretation of this passage is correct,—neither shall a man take another wife,—two wives, or you must admit that this passage means two literal sisters, and in either case you live in violation of God’s law. It is for my distinguished friend to choose which horn of the dilemma he pleases. I thank him for the compliment he paid me—that I came here as a philanthropist. I have only kindness in my heart for these dear men and women; and had not this kindness filled my heart; had I believed in a crushing, iron, civil law, I could have remained in Washington. But I came here believing the truth as it is in Jesus, and I am glad to say that I have the privilege of speaking what I believe to be God’s truth in your hearing.

The gentleman quoted Deuteronomy xxi, 15-17, which is the law of primogeniture, and is designed to preserve the descent of property:

If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, *both* the beloved and the hated; and *if* the first-born son be hers that was hated;

Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit *that* which he hath, *that* he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, *which is indeed* the first-born:

But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated *for* the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; for the right of the first-born is his.

How did he apply this law? Why he first assumed the prevalence of polygamy among the Jews in the wilderness, and then said the law was made for polygamous families as well as for monogamous. He says—"inasmuch as polygamy is nowhere condemned in the law of God, we are entitled to construe this law as applying to polygamists." But I have shown already that Leviticus xviii. 18. is a positive prohibition of this law, and therefore this passage must be interpreted by that which I have quoted. I propose to elect the balance to-day, and try every scriptural argument which he has produced in the scales of justice.

I have recited to you God's solemn law—"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another:" and I will try every passage by this law. My friend spent an hour here yesterday in seeking a general law; in a minute I gave you a general law. How natural is the supposition, where a man has two wives in succession, that he may love the last a little better than the first! and I believe it is common out here to love the last a little better than the first. And how natural it is for the second wife to influence the father in the disposition of his property so that he will confer it upon her child! while the children of the first wife, poor woman, perhaps dead and gone, are deprived of their property rights. But supposing the meaning of this passage is two wives at the same time, this cannot be construed, by any of the accepted rules of interpretation, into a sanction of polygamy; if it can, I can prove that sheep stealing is just as divinely authorized. For it is as if Moses had said: "for in view of the prevalence of polygamy, and that you have so far forgotten and transgressed God's law of monogamy as to take two wives at the same time, therefore this shall not work the abrogation of the law of primogeniture, the first-born son shall not thereby be cheated out of his rights." Now it is said: "if a man have two wives:" very well, if that is a privilege so also are these words: "if a man shall steal an ox or a sheep and kill it and sell it, he shall restore five oxen for the ox he stole, and four sheep for the sheep." If the former assertion is a sanction of polygamy, then the latter assertion is a sanction of sheep stealing, and we can all go after the flocks this afternoon.

The second passage, in Exodus xxi, 7th to 11th verses, referring to the laws of breach of promise, Mr. Pratt says proves or favors polygamy, in his opinion; but he did not dwell long upon this text. He indulged in an episode on the lost manuscripts. Now let us inquire into the meaning of this passage:

And if a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do.

If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her.

And if he hath betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters.

If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish.

And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.

What are the significant points in this passage? They are simply these—According to the Jewish law a destitute Jew was permitted to apprentice his daughter for six years for a pecuniary consideration; and to guard the rights of this girl there were certain conditions: First, the period of her indenture should not extend beyond six years; she should be free at the death of her master, or at the coming of the year of jubilee. The next condition was that the master or his son should marry the girl. What therefore are we to conclude from this passage? Simply this: that neither the father nor the son marry the girl, but simply betrothed her; that is, engaged her, promised to marry her: but before the marriage relation was consummated the young man changed his mind, and then God Almighty, to indicate his displeasure at a man who would break the vow of engagement, fixes the following penalties, namely, that he shall provide for this woman, whom he has wronged, her food, her raiment and her dwelling, and these are the facts: and the gentleman has not proved, the gentleman cannot prove, that either the father or the son marry the girl. He says the honored term “wife” is there. Honored term! God bless that term! It is an honored term, sacred as the nature of angels. Yet I have to inform my distinguished friend that the word wife is neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek, but simply “if he take another,” that is if he betroth another, and then change his mind he shall do thus and so. Where then is the gentleman’s general law in approval of polygamy?

The next passage is recorded in Deuteronomy xxv chap., and from the 5th to the 10th verses, referring to the preservation of families:

If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband’s brother shall go in unto her, and take her unto him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband’s brother unto her.

And it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.

And if the man like not to take his brother’s wife, then let his brother’s wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband’s brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband’s brother.

Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him, and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her;

Then shall his brother’s wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother’s house.

And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of him that hath his shoe loosed.

What is the object of this law? Evidently the preservation of families and family inheritances. And now I challenge the gentle-

man to bring forward a solitary instance in the Bible where a married man was compelled to obey this law. Take the case of Tamar ! Certainly the brother that was to have married her could not have been a married man, because she had to wait until he grew up. Then take the case of Ruth. You know how she lost her noble Mahlon afar off beyond Jordan, and how she returned to Bethlehem, and goes to Boaz, a near kinsman, and demands that he shall marry her. Boaz says—"there is another kinsman. I will speak to him." It is asked—"Didn't Boaz know whether the nearer kinsman was married?" but yet that was not the business of Boaz. The divine law required that this man should appear at the gate of the city before the elders, and there either marry her or say that he was disqualified because he was already a married man ; and there is no proof in the Bible that Boaz had been married ; nay, more than this, old Josephus, the Jewish historian, asserts that the reason why the near kinsman did not marry Ruth was that he had a wife and children already, so I judge that this law, which is said to be general, is that that I laid down—"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another," etc. He refers me to numbers xxxi, 17th and 18th verses :

Now therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him.

But all the women-children, that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.

This passage has nothing whatever to do with polygamy. It is an account of the results of a military expedition of the Jews against the Midianites ; their slaughter of a portion of the people, and their reduction of the remainder to slavery—namely the women for domestics. My friend dwells upon thirty-two thousand women that were saved ! What were these among the Jewish nation—a people numbering two and a half millions ?

He quotes Deuteronomy xxi, 10th and 13th verses :

When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive ;

And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her that thou wouldst have her to thy wife ;

Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house ; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails ;

And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month : and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband and she shall be thy wife.

This passage is designed to regulate the treatment of a captive women by the conqueror who desires her for a wife, and has no more to do with polygamy than it has to do with theft or murder. Not a solitary word is said about polygamy, no mention is made that the man is married, therefore every jurist will agree with me that where we find a general law we may judge a special enactment by the organic, fundamental principle.

He quoted Exodus xxii chap., 16 and 17 ; and Deuteronomy xxii, and 28 and 29 :

And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.

If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

In Deuteronomy it is said :

If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found ;

Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife ; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

My friend appeared to confound these two laws, as if they had reference to the same crime ; but the first is the law of seduction, while the second was the law of rape. In both cases the defiler was required to marry his victim ; but in the case of seduction, if the father of the seduced girl would not consent to the marriage, then the sum usual to the dowry of a virgin should be paid him and the offense was expiated. But what was the penalty of rape ? In that case there is no ambiguity—the ravisher married his victim and paid her father fifty pieces of silver besides. But what has this to do with polygamy ? He says it is a general law and applies to married men. This cannot be so, because it is in conflict with the great law of Leviticus xviii, 18.

I tell you, my friends, these are simple downright assumptions. The position is first taken, and therefore these passages adduced to sustain that position ; and this gentleman goes on to assume that all these men are married men. It is a tremendous fact, that if a man seduced a girl or committed a rape upon her, he was bound to marry that girl. It is a tremendous fact that the same law gives to the father the right of the refusal of his daughter, therefore the father has the power to annul God's law of marriage.

The next passage is the 2nd Chronicles, xxiv and 3rd, &c. It is the case of Joash the king, and when he began to reign Jehoiada was high priest. He was more than that—he was regent. My friend in portraying the character of this great man said that because he took two wives for King Joash he was so highly honored that when he died he was buried among the kings. But the fact is, he was regent, and there was royalty in his regency, and this royalty entitled him to be interred in the royal mausoleum. All that is said in Chronicles is simply an epitome—a summing up, that King Joash had two wives. It does not say that he had them at the same time ; he might have had them in succession. I give you an illustration : John Milton was born in London, 1609. He was an eminent scholar, a great statesman and a beautiful poet ; and John Milton had three wives. There I stop. Are you to infer that John Milton had these three wives simultaneously ? Why you might according to the gentleman's interpretation of this passage. But John Milton had them in succession. But more than this, for argument's sake grant the position assumed by my friend, then the numerical element of the argument must come out, and a man can only have two wives and no more. Do you keep that law here ? And yet that is the argument and that is the logical conclusion.



The last passage my friend referred to was the 1st chapter of Hosea, and 2nd verse :

The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea. And the Lord said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms, and children of whoredoms : for the land hath committed great whoredoms, departing from the Lord.

That is, says Newcomb, a wife from among the Israelites, who were remarkable for spiritual fornication. My friend is so determined on a literal interpretation that he gives a literal interpretation, whereas this distinguished Biblical scholar says that it was not literal fornication, but rather spiritual ; in other words, idolatry ; for in the Scriptures, both the Old and New Testament, idolatry is mentioned under the term fornication. God calls himself the husband of Israel, and this chosen nation owed him the fidelity of a wife. Exodus the xxxiv Chapter and 15th verse :

Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice.

The 14th verse of the same chapter says :

For thou shalt worship no other god : for the Lord, whose name is jealous, is a jealous God.

He therefore sees thee with indignation join thyself in marriage to one of those who had committed fornication or spiritual idolatry, lest they should raise up children, who, by the power of example, might lay themselves under the terribleness of idolatry. The prophet is directed to get a wife of whoredoms ; and, after this, he is directed to go and love an adulterous woman. My friend cites these as examples where God makes an exception to a general law. He also cites the case of Abraham offering up his son Isaac, and the case of consanguinity, Deuteronomy xxv, from 5th to 10th verse. Now the first three cases were merely typical ; the first two were designed to set forth more impressively the relations between God and his people. The case of consanguinity has nothing to do with polygamy. It is only a modification or exception in special cases for the preservation of the families of Israel from extinction. Where, therefore, I ask, is the general law ?

But my friend has forgotten this fact, that after having divorced the first wife for adultery, as he had a right to do, in chapter ii, 2nd and 5th verses, he is then directed to go and take another wife. This is not polygamy. It was represented to us here, yesterday, that this prophet, Hosea, was first commanded to take a woman guilty of adultery or fornication, and then to take an adulteress, and the representation was made that he took them and had them at the same time ; whereas, if Mr. Pratt had read a little further, he would have found that the prophet divorced the first wife for adultery, and he had a right to do it ; and after he divorced her, then he went and took a second wife.

Professor Pratt admits, mark you, admits that none of these

passages, nor all of them together, can afford in this day a warrant for the practice of polygamy. Gives it up! Turns the Bible aside! I will read to you from his own words:

Supposing that we should prove by a thousand evidences from the Bible that polygamy was practised by ancient Israel and was sanctioned by God in ancient days, would that be any reason that you and I should practise it? By no means. We must get a command independently of that, which we have received. God frequently repeats His commands, and His servants are required to obey His commands when they are given. The Latter-day Saints in this Territory practise polygamy; not because the law of Moses commands it; not because it was extensively practised by the best of men we know of, mentioned in the Bible, the old patriarchs, Abraham and Jacob and others, who are saved in the kingdom of God. We have no right to practise it because they did it.

Then he yields the point! I respectfully ask him, if this is his position, why does he attempt, in all his writings, and to establish it in that clever book the *Seer*? Why did he, in his controversy with me in the *New York Herald*? Why has he from this stand attempted to prove that the practice of polygamy was right from the Bible? Why not, like a man, come out and say that we practise this system here, not because the Jews did it; not because the Divine law sanctioned it years ago; but because a certain man of the name of Smith received a revelation that this form of marriage was to be practised? You, my friends, can see the logical conclusion, or in other words the illogical bearing.

Now, I come to the assumptions by the gentleman. First, that there is no law condemning or forbidding polygamy. Has he proved that? Second, that the Hebrew nation, as it was in the wilderness, when the Mosaic code was given, was polygamous. Has he proved that? Can he find in the whole history of the Jewish nation, from the time they left Egypt to the time they entered the land of Caanan, can he find more than one instance of polygamy? Perhaps he may find two. I will be glad to receive that information, for I am a man seeking light, and to-day I throw down a challenge to your eminent defender of the faith, to produce more than two instances of polygamy, from the time the Jews left the land of Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. I will assist him in his research and tell him one, and that was Caleb. Now supposing that a murder should be committed in your city, would it be fair for Eastern papers to say that the Mormons are a murderous people? No, I would rise up in defence of you; I would say that that is a crime and an injury to the people here! Yet, during a period of forty years we find one man out of two millions and a half of people practising polygamy, and my friend comes forward and assumes that the Israelites were polygamists.

Third, that these laws were given to regulate among them an institution already existing. Has he proved that? Supposing he could prove that Moses attempted, or did legislate for the regulation of polygamy, as it did exist in Egypt and elsewhere, would such legislation establish a sanction? Why in Paris they have laws regulating the social evil: is that an approval of the social evil? There are laws in most of the States regulating and controlling intemperance. Do excise laws sanction intemperance? Nothing of

the kind. For argument's sake I would be willing to concede that Moses did legislate in regard to polygamy, that is to regulate it, to confine its evils; and yet my friend is too much of a legislator to stand here and assert that laws regulating and defining were an approval of a system.

Fourth, that these laws were general, applying to all men, married and unmarried. Has he proved that? I have proved to the contrary to-day, showing that in the passages which he quoted there is not a solitary or remote intimation that the men were married.

Now let us, in opposition to these assumptions remember that monogamy was established by God in the innocence of the human race, and that polygamy, like idolatry, and slavery, blood revenge, drunkenness and murder came into existence after the apostasy of the human family, and that neither of these evils have any other origin so far as appears from the Bible than in the wickedness of man. We admit that polygamy existed among the corrupt nations, just as any other evil, or vice, or crime existed, and now when God had chosen the Hebrews for His own people, to separate them from the heathen, He gives them for the first time a code of laws, and especially on the subject of the commerce of the sexes. And what is the central principle of that code on this subject? Read Leviticus xviii, 18—"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another."

In this code the following things are forbidden: Incest, polygamy, fornication, idolatry, beastliness, &c.; we therefore deny that the nation was polygamous at that time, deny it definitely, deny it distinctly, and on another occasion I will give you the character of the monogamists and polygamists of Bible times. The Jews had been four hundred years in slavery, and they were brought out with a strong hand and an outstretched arm.

We, to-day, then challenge for the proof that as a nation the Jews were polygamous. One or two instances, as I have already remarked, can be adduced. We may say again that if, as he assumes, these laws were given to regulate the existing system, this does not sanction it any more than the same thing sanctions sheep-stealing or homicide. He said these laws were general, applying to all men, married or unmarried. Has he proved it? This is wholly gratuitous. There is no word in either of these passages which permits or directs a married man to take more than one wife at a time. I challenge the gentleman for the proof. It is no evidence of the sanction of polygamy to bring passage after passage, which he knows, if construed in favor of polygamy, polygamy must be in direct conflict with the great organic law recorded in Leviticus xviii, 18.

[At this point the umpires announced that the time was up.]

## THIRD AND CLOSING DAY.

---

PROF. ORSON PRATT.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :

We have assembled ourselves in this vast congregation in the third session of our discussion, to take into consideration the Divinity of a very important institution of the Bible. The question, as you have already heard, is "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" Many arguments have already been adduced, on the side of the affirmative, and also on the side of the negative. This afternoon one hour is allotted me in the discussion, to bring forth still further evidences, which will close the debate, so far as the affirmative is concerned; then to be followed by the Reverend Dr. Newman, which will finally close the discussion.

Polygamy is a question, or in other words, is an institution of the Bible; an institution established, as we have already shown, by Divine authority; established by law—by command; and hence, of course, must be sanctioned by the great Divine Law-Giver, whose words are recorded in the Bible.

Yesterday I was challenged by the Reverend Dr. Newman, to bring forth any evidence whatever to prove that there were more than two polygamist families in all Israel during the time of their sojourn in the wilderness. At least this is what I understood the gentleman to say. I shall now proceed to bring forth the proof.

The statistics of Israel in the days of Moses show that there were of males, over 20 years of age, Numbers 1st chapter, 49 verse :

Even all they that were numbered, were six hundred thousand and three thousand, and five hundred and fifty.

It was admitted, yesterday afternoon, by Dr. Newman, that there were two and a half millions of Israelites. Now I shall take the position that the females among the Israelites were far more numerous than the males; I mean that portion of them that were over twenty years of age. I assume this for this reason, that from the birth of Moses down until the time that the Israelites were brought out of Egypt some eighty years had elapsed. The destruction of the male children had commenced before the birth of Moses; how many years before I know not. The order of King Pharaoh was to destroy every male child. All the people, subject to this ruler, were commanded to see that they were destroyed and thrown into the river Nile. How long a period this great destruction con-

tinued is unknown, but if we suppose that one male child to every two hundred and fifty persons was annually destroyed, it would amount to the number of ten thousand yearly. This would soon begin to tell in the difference between the numbers of males and females. Ten thousand each year would only be one male child to each two hundred and fifty persons. How many would this make from the birth of Moses, or eighty years? It would amount to 800,000 females above that of males. But I do not wish to take advantage in this argument by assuming too high a number. I will diminish it one half, which will still leave 400,000 more females than males. This would be one male destroyed each year out of every five hundred persons. The females, then, over twenty years of age would be 603,550, added to 400,000 surplus women, making in all 1,003,550 women over twenty years of age. The children, then, under twenty years of age, to make up the two and a half millions, would be 892,900, the total population of Israel being laid down at 2,500,000.

Now, then, for the number of families constituting this population. The families having first-born males over one month old, see Numbers iii chapter and 43d verse, numbered 22,273. Families having no male children over one month old we may suppose to have been in the ratio of one-third of the former class of families, which would make 7,424 additional families. Add these to the 22,273 with first-born males, and we have the sum total of 29,697 as the number of the families in Israel. Now, in order to favor the monogamists' argument, and give them all the advantage possible, we will still add to this number to make it even—303 families more, making thirty thousand families in all. Now comes another species of calculation founded on this data: Divide twenty-five hundred thousand persons by 22,273 first-born males, and we find one first-born male to every 112 persons. What a large family for a monogamist! But divide 2,500,000 persons by 30,000 and the quotient gives eighty-three persons in a family. Suppose these families to have been monogamic, after deducting husband and wife, we have the very respectable number of eighty-one children to each monogamic wife. If we assume the numbers of the males and females to have been equal, making no allowance for the destruction of the male infants, we shall then have to increase the children under twenty years of age to keep good the number of two and a half millions. This would still make eighty-one children to each of the 30,000 monogamic households. Now let us examine these dates in connection with polygamy. If we suppose the average number of wives to have been seven, in each household, though there may have been men who had no wife at all, and there may have been some who had but one wife; and there may have been others having from one up to say thirty wives, yet if we average them at seven wives each, we would then have one husband, seven wives and seventy-five children to make up the average number of eighty-three in the family, in a polygamic household. This would give an average of over ten children apiece to each of the 210,000 polygamic wives. When we deduct the 30,000 husbands from the 603,550 men over twenty years

old, we have 573,550 unmarried men in Israel. If we deduct the 210,000 married women from the total of 1,003,550 over twenty years of age, we have 793,550 left. This would be enough to supply all the unmarried men with one wife each, leaving still a balance of 220,000 unmarried females to live old maids or enter into polygamic households.

The law guaranteeing the rights of the first-born, which has been referred to in other portions of our discussion, includes those 22,273 first-born male children in Israel, that is, one first-born male child to every 112 persons in Israel; taking the population as represented by our learned friend, Mr. Newman, at two and a half millions. Thus we see that there was a law given to regulate the rights of the first-born, applying to over 22,000 first-born male children in Israel, giving them a double portion of the goods and inheritances of their fathers.

Having brought forth these statistics, let us for a few moments examine more closely these results. How can any one assume Israel to have been monogamic and be consistent? I presume that my honored friend, notwithstanding his great desire and earnestness to overthrow the Divine evidences in favor of polygamy, would not say to this people that one wife could bring forth eighty-one children. We can depend upon these proofs—upon these biblical statistics. If he assumes that the males and females were nearly equal in number, that Israel was a monogamic people, then let Mr. Newman show how these great and wonderful households could be produced in Israel, if there were only two polygamic families in the nation. It would require something more wonderful than the herb called "*Mandrake*," referred to by Dr. Newman in his rejoinder to my reply to him in the New York *Herald*. I think he will not be able to find, in our day, an herb with such wonderfully efficacious properties, which will produce such remarkable results.

I have therefore established that Israel was a polygamic nation when God gave them the laws which I have quoted, laws to govern and regulate a people among whom were polygamic and monogamic families. The nation was founded in polygamy in the days of Jacob, and was continued in polygamy until they became very numerous, very great and very powerful, while here and there might be found a monogamic family—a man with one wife. Now if God gave laws to a people having these two forms of marriage in the wilderness, He would adapt such laws to all. He would not take up isolated instances here and there of a man having one wife, but He would adapt His laws to the whole; to both the polygamic and monogamic forms of marriage throughout all Israel.

But we are informed by the reverend Doctor that the law given for the regulation of matters in the polygamic form of marriage bears upon the face of it the condemnation of polygamy. And to justify his assertion he refers to the laws that have been passed in Paris to regulate the social evil; and to the excise laws passed in our own country to regulate intemperance; and claims that these laws for the regulation of evils are condemnatory of the crimes to which they apply. But when Parisians pass laws to regulate the social

evil they acknowledge it as a crime. When the inhabitants of this country pass laws to regulate intemperance, they thereby denounce it as a crime. And when God gives laws, or even when human legislatures make penal laws, they denounce as crimes the acts against which these laws are directed, and attach penalties to them for disobedience. When the law was given of God against murder, it was denounced as a crime by the very penalty attached, which was death; and when the law was given against adultery its enormity was marked by the punishment—the criminal was to be stoned to death. It was a crime, and was so denounced when the law was given. God gave laws to regulate these things in Israel; but because He has regulated many great and abominable crimes by law, has He no right to regulate that which is good and moral as well as that which is wicked and immoral? For instance, God introduced the law of circumcision and gave commands regulating it; shall we, therefore say, according to the logic of the gentleman, that circumcision was condemned by the law of God, because it was regulated by the law of God? That would be his logic, and the natural conclusion according to his logic. Again, when God introduced the Passover. He gave laws how it should be conducted. Does that condemn the Passover as being immoral because regulated by law? But still closer home, God gave laws to regulate the monogamic form of marriage. Does that prove that monogamy is condemned by the law of God, because thus regulated? Oh, that kind of logic will never do!

Now, then, we come to that passage in Leviticus the xviii chapter, and the 18th verse, the passage that was so often referred to in the gentleman's reply yesterday afternoon. I was very glad to hear the gentleman refer to this passage. The law, according to King James' translation, as we heard yesterday afternoon, reads thus: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life-time." That was the law according to King James' translation. My friend, together with Doctors Dwight and Edwards, and several other celebrated commentators, disagree with that interpretation; and somebody, I know not whom, some unauthorized person, has inserted in the margin another interpretation: recollect, in the margin and not in the text. It is argued that this interpretation in the margin must be correct, while King James' translators must have been mistaken. Now, recollect that the great commentators who have thus altered King James' translation were monogamists. So were the translators of the Bible; they, too, were monogamists. But with regard to the true translation of this passage, it has been argued by my learned friend that the Hebrew—the original Hebrew—signifies something a little different from that which is contained in King James' translation. These are his words, as will be found in his sermon preached at Washington, upon this same subject: "But in verse 18 the law against polygamy is given, 'Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister;' or, as the marginal reading is, 'Thou shalt not take one wife to another.' And this rendering is sustained by Cookson, by Bishop Jewell and by Drs. Edwards and Dwight," four eminent

monogamists, interested in sustaining monogamy. According to Dr. Edwards, the words which we translate 'a wife to her sister' are found in the Hebrew but eight times. Now, we have not been favored with these authorities, we have had no access to them. Here in these mountain wilds it is very difficult to get books. In each passage they refer to inanimate objects; that is, in each of the eight places where the words are found. We have searched for them in the Hebrew and can refer you to each passage where they occur. And each time they refer to objects joined together, such as wings, loops, curtains, etc., and signify coupling together. The gentleman reads the passage "Thou shalt not take one wife to another," and understands it as involving the likeness of one thing to another, which is correct. But does the language forbid, as the margin expresses it, the taking of one wife to another? No; We have the privilege, according to the rules or articles of debate, which have been read this afternoon, to apply to the original Hebrew. What are the Hebrew words—the original—that are used? *Veishah el-ahotah lo tikkah*: this, when literally translated and transposed is, "neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister," *veishah* being translated by King James' translation "a wife," *el-ahotah* being translated "to her sister;" *lo* is translated "neither;" while *tikkah* is translated by King James' translators "shalt thou take." They have certainly given a literal translation. Appeal to the Hebrew and you will find the word *ishah* occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated "wife." The word *ahotah*, translated by King James' translators "a sister," occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated "sister." But are these the only translations—the only renderings? *Ishah*, when it is followed by *ahot* has another rendering. That is when "wife" is followed by "sister" there is another rendering.

Translators have no right to give a double translation to the same Hebrew word, in the same phrase: if they translate *veishah* one, they are not at liberty to translate the same word in the same phrase over again and call it wife. This Dr. Edwards, or some other monogamist, has done, and inserted this false translation in the margin. What object such translator had in deceiving the public must be best known to himself; he probably was actuated by a zeal to find some law against polygamy, and concluded to manufacture the word "wife," and place it in the margin, without any original Hebrew word to represent it. *Ahot*, when standing alone is rendered *sister*; when preceded by *ishah*, is rendered *another*; the suffix *ah*, attached to *ahot*, is translated "*her*;" both together (*ahot-ah*) are rendered "*her sister*," that is *sister's sister*; when *ahot* is rendered "*another*," its suffix *ah* represents "*her*" or more properly the noun *sister*, for which it stands. The phrase will then read; *Veishah* (one) *el-ahotah* (sister to another) *lo* (neither) *tikkah* (shalt thou take) which, when transposed, reads thus: *Neither shalt thou take one sister to another*. This form of translation agrees with the rendering given to the same Hebrew words or phrase in the seven other passages of Scripture, referred to by Dr. Newman and Dr. Edwards. (See Exodus xxvi, 3, 5; Ezekiel i, 9, 11, 23; also iii, 13.)



It will be seen that the latter form of translation gives precisely the same idea as that given by the English translators in the text. It also agrees with the twelve preceding verses of the law, prohibiting intermarriages among blood relations, and forms a part and parcel of the same code; while the word "wife," inserted in the margin, is not, and cannot, by any possible rule of interpretation, be extorted from the original connection with the second form of translation.

Why should King James' literal translation "wife" and "sister" be set aside for "one to another?" There is this difference: in all the other seven passages where the words *Veishah el-ahotah* occur, there is a noun in the nominative case preceding them, denoting something to be coupled together. Exodus 26th chapter, 3rd verse contains *ishah el-ahotah* twice, signifying to couple together the curtains one to another, the same words being used that are used in this text. Go to the fifth verse of the same chapter, and there we have the loops of the curtains joined together one to another, the noun in the nominative case being expressed. Next go to Ezekiel, 1st chapter, 9th, 11th and 23d verses, and these three passages give the rendering of these same words, coupling the wings of the cherubim one to another. Then go again to the 3rd chapter of Ezekiel and 13th verse, and the wings of the living creatures were joined together one to another. But in the text under consideration no such noun in the nominative case occurs; and hence the English translators were compelled to give each word its literal translation.

The law was given to prevent quarrels, which are apt to arise among blood relations. We might look for quarrels on the other side between women who were not related by blood; but what are the facts in relation to quarrels between blood relations? Go back to Cain and Abel. Who was it that spilled the blood of Abel? It was a blood relation, his brother. Who was it that cast Joseph into the pit to perish with hunger, and afterwards dragged him forth from his den and sold him as a slave to persons trading through the country? It was blood relations. Who slew the seventy sons of Gideon upon one stone? It was one of their own brothers that hired men to do it. Who was it that rebelled against King David, and caused him with all his wives and household, excepting ten concubines, to flee out of Jerusalem? It was his blood relation, his own son Absalom. Who quarreled in the family of Jacob? Did Bilhah quarrel with Zilpah? No. Did Leah quarrel with Bilhah or Zilpah? No such thing is recorded. Did Rachel quarrel with either of the handmaids? There is not a word concerning the matter. The little, petty difficulties occurred between the two sisters, blood relations, Rachel and Leah. And this law was probably given to prevent such vexations between blood relations—between sister and sister.

Having effectually proved the marginal reading to be false, I will now defy not only the learned gentleman, but all the world of Hebrew scholars to find any word in the original to be translated "wife" if *ishah* be first translated "one."

I am informed I have only fifteen minutes. I was not aware I

had spoken a quarter of the time. I shall have to leave this subject and proceed to another.

The next subject to which I will call your attention is in regard to the general or unlimited language of the laws given in the various passages which I have quoted. If a man shall commit rape, if a man shall entice a maid, if a man shall do this, or that, or the other, is the language of these passages. Will any person pretend to say that a married man is not a man? And if a married person is a man, it proves that the law is applicable to married men, and if so, it rests with my learned friend to prove that it is limited. Moreover, the passage from the margin in Leviticus was quoted by Dr. Newman as a great fundamental law by which all the other passages were to be overturned. But it has failed; and, therefore, the other passages quoted by me stand good unless something else can be found by the learned gentleman to support his forlorn hope.

Perhaps we may hear quoted in the answer to my remarks the passage that the future king of Israel was not to multiply wives to himself. That was the law. The word multiply is construed by those opposed to polygamy to mean that twice one make two, and hence that he was not to multiply wives, or, in other words, that he was not to take two. But the command was also given that the future king of Israel was not to multiply horses any more than wives. Twice one make two again. Was the future king of Israel not to have more than one horse? The idea is ridiculous! The future king of Israel was not to multiply them; not to have them in multitude, that is, only to take such a number as God saw proper to give him.

We might next refer you to the uncle of Ruth's dead husband, old Boaz, who represented himself as not being the nearest kin. There was another nearer who had the Divine right to take her, and this other happened to be the brother of Boaz, perhaps a little older. Josephus tells us, according to the learned gentleman, that this oldest brother was a married man. Suppose we admit it. Did Boaz not know that his brother was married when he represented him as the nearest of kin and had the right before him? And even the brother acknowledges his right, and says to Boaz: "Redeem thou my right to thyself." He had the right to marry her. This, then, we arrive at by the assistance of Josephus; and it proves that married men were required to comply with the law. I have no further time to remark on this passage. I wish now to examine a passage that is contained in Matthew, in regard to divorces, and also in Malachi, on the same subject. Malachi, or the Lord by the mouth of Malachi, informs the people that the Lord hated putting away. He gave the reason why a wife should not be put away. Not a word against polygamy in either passage.

But there is certain reasoning introduced to show that a wife should not be put away. In the beginning the Lord made one, that is a wife for Adam, that he might not be alone. Woman was given to man for a companion, that he might protect her, and for other holy purposes, but not to be put away for trivial causes; and it was cause of condemnation in those days for a man to put away his

wife. But there is not a word in Malachi condemnatory of a man marrying more than one wife. Jesus also gives the law respecting divorces, that they should not put away their wives for any other cause than that of fornication; and he that took a wife that was put away would commit adultery. Jesus says, in the 5th chapter, that he that putteth away his wife for any other cause than fornication causes her to commit adultery. Then the husband is a guilty accomplice, and if he puts away his wife unjustly he is guilty of adultery himself, the same as a confederate in murder is himself a murderer. As an adulterer he has no right to take another wife; he has not the right to take even one wife. His right is to be stoned to death; to suffer the penalty of death for his sin of adultery. Consequently, if he has no right to even life itself, he has no right to a wife. But the case of such a man, who has become an adulterer by putting away his wife, and has no right to marry another, has no application, nor has the argument drawn from it any application, to the man who keeps his wife and takes another. The law referred to by my learned opponent, in Leviticus xviii and 18, shows that polygamy was in existence, but was to be kept within the circle of those who were not blood relations.

Concerning the phrase "duty of marriage," occurring in the passage, "If a man take another wife, her food, her raiment and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish." The condition here referred to is something more than mere betrothal. It is something showing that the individual has been not merely previously betrothed, but is actually in the married state, and the duty of marriage is clearly expressed. What is the meaning of the original word? It does not mean dwelling nor refuge, as asserted in the *New York Herald* by Dr. Newman. Four passages are quoted by him in which the Hebrew word for dwelling occurs, but the word translated "duty" of marriage, is entirely a distinct word from that used in the four passages referred to. Does not the learned Dr. know the difference between two Hebrew words? Or what was his object in referring to a word elsewhere in the Scripture that does not even occur in the text under consideration? In a Hebrew and English Lexicon (published by Josiah W. Gibbs, A. M., Prof. of Sacred Liter. in the Theological School in Yale College), page 160, it refers to this very Hebrew word and to the very passage, Ex. xxxi, 10, and translates it thus:—"cohabitation,"—"duty of marriage." "Duty of marriage" then is "cohabitation;" thus God commands a man who takes another wife, not to diminish the duty of cohabitation with the first. Would God command undiminished "cohabitation" with a woman merely betrothed and not married?

While I have a few moments left let me refer you to Hosea. I wish all of you, when you go home, to read the second chapter of Hosea, and you will find, with regard to Hosea's having divorced his first wife because of her whoredoms, that no such thing is recorded as stated by Mr. Newman yesterday. The Lord tells Hosea to go and speak to his brethren (not to his son), to his sisters (not his daughter), of the house of Israel, and tell them what the Lord will do; that he may not acknowledge them any longer as a wife.

Hosea bore the word of the Lord to Israel, whom his own two wives represented, saying that their whoredoms, their wickedness and idolatries had kindled the anger of the Lord against them.

Having discussed the subject so far I leave it now with all candid persons to judge. Here is the law of God; here is the command of the Most High, general in its nature, not limited, nor can it be proved to be so. There is no law against it, but it stands as immovable as the Rock of Ages, and will stand when all things on the earth and the earth itself shall pass away.

---

### Dr. J. P. NEWMAN Said:

RESPECTED UMPIRES, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I had heard, prior to my coming to your city, that my distinguished opponent was eminent in mathematics, and certainly his display to-day confirms that reputation. Unfortunately, however, he is incorrect in his statements. First, he assumes that the slaying of all the male children of the Hebrews was continued through eighty years; but he has failed to produce the proof. To do this was his starting point. He assumes it; where is the proof, either in the Bible or in Josephus? And until he can prove that the destruction of the male children went on for eighty years, I say this argument has no more foundation than a vision. Then he makes another blunder: the 303,550, the number of men above twenty years of age, mentioned in this case, were men to go to war; they were not the total population of the Jewish nation, and yet my mathematical friend stands up here to-day and declares that the whole male population above twenty years of age consisted of 303,550, whereas it is a fact that this number did not include all the males.

Then again the 22,273 first-born do not represent the number of families in Israel at that time, for many of the first-born were dead. These are the blunders that the gentleman has made to-day, and I challenge him to produce the contrary and prove that he is not guilty of these numerical blunders. Then he denies the assertion made yesterday that there could not be brought forward more than one or two instances of polygamy in the history of Israel from the time the Hebrews left Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. Has he disproved that? He has attempted to prove it by a mathematical problem, which problem is based on error: his premises are wrong, therefore his conclusions are false. Why didn't he turn to King James' translation? I will help him to one polygamist, that is Caleb. Why didn't he start with old Caleb and go down and give us name after name and date after date of the polygamists recorded in the history of the Jews while they were in the wilderness? Ladies and gentlemen, he had none to give, and therefore the assertion made yesterday is true, that during the sojourn

of the children of Israel in the wilderness there is but one instance of polygamy recorded.

Now we come to the law that I laid down yesterday—"Neither shalt thou take one wife to another." I reaffirm that the translation in the margin is perfect to a word. He labors to show that God does not mean what he says. That the phrase "one wife to another," may be equally rendered one woman to another, or one wife to her sister. The very same phrase is used in the other seven passages named by Dr. Dwight. For example, Exodus xxvi, 3, Ezekiel i, 9, etc. He admits the translation in these passages to be correct. If it is correct in these passages, why is it not correct in the other? His very admission knocks to pieces his argument. Why then does he labor to create the impression that the Hebrew *ishau* means woman or wife: What is the object of the travail of his soul? the word *ahoot*, he contends, means sister; but sister itself, is a word which means a specific relation, and a generic relation. Every woman is sister to every other woman, and I challenge the gentleman to meet me on paper at any time, in the newspapers of your city or elsewhere upon the Hebrew of this text. I reaffirm it, reaffirm it in the hearing of this learned gentleman, reaffirm it in the hearing of these Hebraists, that as it is said in the margin, is the true rendering, namely, "neither shalt thou take one wife to another." But supposing that is incorrect, permit me, before I pass on, to remind you of this fact: he refers, I think, in his first speech, to the "margin;" the "margin" was correct then and there, but it is not here. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways; correct when he wants to quote from the "margin," but not when I want to do so. He quoted from the margin, and I followed his illustrious example.

And now, my friends, supposing that the text means just what he says, namely "neither shalt thou take a wife unto her sister, to vex her:" supposing that is the rendering, and he asserts it is, and he is a Hebraist, I argued and brought the proof yesterday that this law of Moses is not kept by the Mormons; in other words their are men in your very midst who have married sisters. Where was the gentleman's solemn denunciation of the violation of God's law? Why did he not lift his voice and vindicate the Divine law? But not a solitary word of disapproval is uttered. Yesterday he pronounced a curse—"cursed is he that conforms not to the words of this law, to do them." Does not the curse rest upon him and upon his people? I gave him the liberty to choose whether this text condemned polygamy, or whether it condemned a man for marrying two sisters; he must take his choice, the horns of the dilemma are before him. For the sake of saving polygamy he stands up here, in the presence of Almighty God and his holy angels, and before this intelligent congregation he admits that in this church, and with this people, God's holy law is set at defiance. What respect, therefore, can we have for the gentleman's argument, drawn from the teachings of Moses, in support of polygamy?

He refers us to the multiplication of horses. I suppose a king may have one horse or two, there is no special rule; but there is a

special rule as to the number of wives. Neither shall the king multiply wives. God, in the beginning, gave the first man one wife, and Christ and Paul sustain that law as binding upon us. And now, supposing that that is not accepted as a law, what then? Why there is no limit to the number of wives, none at all. How many shall a man have? Seven, twenty, fifty, sixty, a hundred? Why, they somewhere quote a passage that if a man forsake his wife he shall have a hundred. Well, he ought to go on forsaking; for if he will forsake a hundred he will have ten thousand; and if he forsake ten thousand he will have so many more in proportion. It is his business to go on forsaking. That is in the Professor's book called the Seer. Such a man would keep the Almighty busy creating women for him.

I regret very much that I have not time to notice all the points which have been brought forward. I desired to do so. I plead for more time; my friends plead for more time; but time was denied us, I am therefore restricted to an hour. Now, I propose to follow out the line of argument which I was pursuing yesterday when my time expired, and I propose to carry out and apply the great law brought forward yesterday—"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another;" and in doing this we call your attention to the fact that in the Bible there are only twenty-five or thirty specially recorded cases of polygamy, all told, out of thousands and millions of people. I say twenty-five or thirty specially recorded cases, which polygamists of our day claim in support of their position. I propose to take up, say half a dozen of the most prominent ones. I divide the period, before the law and after the law. I take up Abraham. It is asserted that he was a polygamist. I deny it. There is no proof that Abraham was guilty of polygamy. What are the facts? When he was called of the Almighty to be the founder of a great nation, a promise was given him that he should have a numerous posterity. At that time he was a monogamist, had but one wife—the noble Sarah. Six years passed and the promise was not fulfilled. Then Sarah, desiring to help the Lord to keep his promise, brought her Egyptian maid Hagar, and offered her as a substitute for herself to Abraham. Mind you, Abraham did not go after Hagar, but Sarah produced her as a substitute. Immediately after the act was performed Sarah discovered her sin and said, "My wrong be upon thee." "I have committed sin, but I did it for thy sake, and therefore the wrong that I have committed is upon thee." Then look at the subsequent facts: by the Divine command this Egyptian girl was sent away from the abode of Abraham by the mutual consent of the husband and the wife; by the Divine command, it is said that she was recognized as the wife of Abraham, but I say you cannot prove it from the Bible; but it is said that she was promised a numerous posterity. It was also foretold that Ishmael should be a wild man—"his hand against every man and every man's hand against him." Did that prediction justify Ishmael in being a robber and a murderer? No, certainly not; neither did the other prediction, that Hagar should have a numerous posterity, justify the action of Abraham in taking her.

After she had been sent away by Divine command, God said unto Abraham—"now walk before me and be thou perfect."

These are the facts, my friends. I know that some will refer you to Keturah; but this is the fact in regard to her: Abraham lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah; the energy miraculously given to Abraham's body for the generation of Isaac was continued after Sarah's death; but to suppose that he took Keturah during Sarah's lifetime is to do violence to his moral character. But it is said he sent away the sons of Keturah with presents during his lifetime, therefore it must have been during the lifetime of Sarah. He lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah, and he sent these sons away eight years before his death, and they were from twenty-five to thirty years old. Then this venerable Patriarch stands forth as a monogamist and not as a polygamist.

Then we come to the case of Jacob. What are the facts in regard to him? Brought up in the sanctity of monogamy, after having robbed his brother of his birth-right, after having lied to his blind old father, he then steals away and goes to Padan-aram and there falls in love with Rachel; but in his bridal bed he finds Rachel's sister Leah. He did not enter polygamy voluntarily, but he was imposed upon. As he had taken advantage of the blindness of his father and thereby imposed upon him; so also was he imposed upon by Laban in the darkness of the night. But I hold this to be true that Jacob is nowhere regarded as a saintly man prior to his conversion at the brook Jabbok. After that he appears to us in a saintly character. It is a remarkable fact that Jacob lived 147 years all told, eighty-seven of which he lived before he became a polygamist. He lived twenty-two years in polygamy, he lived forty years after he had abandoned polygamy, so that out of 147 years there were only twenty-two years during which he had any connection with polygamy.

I wish my friend had referred to the case of Moses. In his sermon on celestial marriage he claims that Moses was a polygamist, and he declares that the leprosy that was sent upon Miriam was for her interference with the polygamous marriage of Moses. What are the facts? There is no record of a second marriage. Zipporah is the only name given as the wife of Moses. What, then is the assertion made? Simply this: It is recorded: and Moses was content to dwell with Jethro. He gave Moses Zipporah, his daughter. Josephus speaks of Jethro having two daughters, and distinctly says that he gave Moses one of them. In Numbers xii and 1st, it is said:

And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman.

Now it is affirmed that two women are here mentioned, whereas nothing can be more untrue. Zipporah and the Ethiopian woman are one and identical; it is one and the same person called by different names. Let us see: The father of Zipporah was the priest of Midian: and according to the best authorities Midian and Ethiopia are identical terms, and apply to that portion of Arabia where

Jethro lived. So the appellation Midian, Ethiopia and Arabia are applied to the Arabian peninsula. (See Appleton's American Encyclopedia, volumes 6, 7 and 11.) Then Moses, the Jewish law-giver, stands forth as a monogamist, having but one wife. Moses was not a polygamist. Surely the founder of a polygamist nation and the revealer of a polygamist law, as this gentleman claims, should have set an example, and should have had a dozen or a hundred wives. This son of Jochebed; he was a monogamist, and stands forth as being a reproof to polygamists in all generations.

Now we come to Gideon. And what about this man? An angel appeared to him, that is true; but if the practice of polygamy by Gideon is a law to us, then the practice of idolatry by Gideon is also a law to us. If there is silence in the Bible touching the polygamy of Gideon, there is also silence in the Bible touching his idolatry, and if one is sanctioned so also is the other.

I wish my friend had brought up the case of Hannah, the wife of Elkanah. I can prove to a demonstration that Hannah was the first wife of Elkanah; but being barren Elkanah takes another wife. But Hannah, in the anxiety of her heart, pleads to the Almighty, and God honored her motherhood by answering her prayer. It is asked "Is not this a sanction of polygamy?" Nay, a sanction of monogamy, because she was the first wife of Elkanah, and because Elkanah had been guilty of infidelity and married another wife, was that a reason why Hannah should not have her rights from High Heaven, why God Almighty should not answer her prayer? You ask me why did not she pray before. Can you tell me why Isaac did not pray twenty years sooner for his wife, Rebecca, that she might have children? I cannot tell, and you cannot tell, all that I assert is that Hannah was the first wife of Elkanah, and God honored and blessed the beautiful Samuel.

Now we come to David. Why did not my friend bring up David, the great warrior, king and poet, the ruler of Israel? He might have mentioned him, with ten wives all told; he might also have mentioned him as the adulterer, who committed one of the most premeditated, cold-blooded murders on record, simply to cover up his crime of adultery. How often do you hear quoted the words "and I gave thy master's wives into thy bosom?" Is this an approval of polygamy? If you will read on you will find also that God also promises to give his (David's) wives to another, and that another should lie with them in the sight of the sun. Surely if one is an approval of polygamy the other is an approval of rebellion and incest! David lived to be seventy-five years old. He was twenty-seven years old when he took his first wife Michael, the daughter of Saul. For the next forty years we find him complicated with the evils, crimes and sorrows of polygamy; and the old man, seeing his great sin, thoroughly repented of it and put it away from him, and for the last eight years of his life endeavored to atone, as best he could, for his troubled and guilty experience.

And what of Solomon? He is the greatest polygamist—the possessor of a thousand wives? Had this gentleman told me that Solomon's greatness was predicted, and therefore his polygamic



birth was approved, and his polygamic marriage also approbated, I can remind him of the fact that the future greatness of Christ was foretold : but the foretelling of the future greatness of the Lord Jesus Christ was not an approval of the betrayal by Judas and the crucifixion by the Jews. Neither was the mere foretelling of the future greatness of Solomon an approval of the polygamic character of his birth.

I suppose the gentleman on this occasion would have referred to the law of bastardy and have said, if my doctrine is true, then Solomon and others were bastards. I could have wished that he had produced that point. He did quote and declare in this temple, not long since, in reference to the law touching bastardy, that a bastard should be branded with infamy to the tenth generation. But it is plain that he has misunderstood the law respecting bastards, as contained in Deuteronomy xxiii, and 2nd. It is known from history that the same signification has not always been attached to this term. We say a bastard is one born out of wedlock, that is monogamous matrimony. In Athens, in the days of Pericles, five centuries before Christ, all were declared bastards by law who were not the children of native Athenians. And we here assert to-day that the gentleman can not bring forward a law from the book of Jewish laws to prove that a child born of a Jew and Jewess, whether married or not, was a bastard. The only child recognized as a bastard by Jewish law is a child born of a Jew and a Pagan woman ; therefore the objection falls to the ground, and Solomon and others, who were not to blame for the character of their birth, are exonerated.

The geometrical progression of evil in this system of polygamy is seen in the first three kings, Saul, David and Solomon. Saul had a wife and a concubine—two women ; David had ten women, Solomon had a thousand, and it broke the kingdom asunder. God says it was for that very cause. He had multiplied his wives to such an extent, that they had not only led him estray from God into idolatry, but the very costliness of his harem was a burden upon the people too heavy for them to bear. I said the other day that polygamy might do for kings and priests and nabobs, but could not do for poor men ; it costs too much and the people are taxed too much to support the harem.

Ah ! you bring forward these few cases of polygamy ! Name them if you please. Lamech, the murderer ; Jacob, who deceived his blind old father, and robbed his brother of his birthright ; David, who seduced another man's wife and murdered that man by putting him in front of the battle, and old Solomon, who turned to be an idolater. These are some polygamists ! Now let me call the roll of honor : There were Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Aaron, Joshua and Joseph and Samuel and all the prophets and apostles. You are accustomed to hear, from this sacred place, that all the patriarchs and all the kings and all the prophets were polygamists. I assert to the contrary, and these great and eminent men whom I have just mentioned, belonging to the roll of honor, were monogamists.

Yesterday the gentleman gave me three challenges : he chal-

lenged me to show that the New Testament condemned polygamy. I now proceed to do it. I quote Paul's words, 1st Corinthians, 7th chap., 2nd and 4th verses:

Nevertheless to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.

The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.

Marriage is a remedy against fornication, and this is the subject of the chapter. This is the opinion of Clark, Henry, Whitby, Langley and others. One great evil prevailed at Corinth—a community of wives, which the apostle here calls fornication. St. Paul strikes at the very root of the evil and commands that every man have his own wife and that every woman have her own husband: that is, let every man have his own peculiar, proper and appropriate wife, and the wife her own proper, peculiar and appropriate husband. In this there is mutual appropriation and exclusiveness of right, and this command of Paul agrees with the law of Moses in Leviticus xviii, 18: “Neither shalt thou take one wife unto another,” and the two are one statute, clear and unquestionable for monogamy and against polygamy. The apostle teaches the reciprocal duties of husband and wife, and the exclusive right of each. In verse four it is distinctly affirmed that the husband has exclusive power over the body of his wife, as the wife has exclusive power over the body of her husband. It is universally admitted that this passage proves the exclusive right of the husband to the wife, and by parity it also proves the exclusive right of the wife to the husband. These relations are mutual, and if the husband can claim a whole wife, the wife can claim a whole husband. She has just as good a right to a whole husband as he has a right to a whole wife. First Corinthians, 6th chapter, 15th, 16th and 17th verses says:

Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.

What! know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two (saith he) shall be one flesh.

But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit.

This passage is brought against the idea, but what are the facts? It is objected that if one flesh is conclusively expressive of wedlock, that St. Paul affirms that sexual commerce with a harlot is marriage. For argument's sake I accept the assertion. The passage in question is: “What! know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body?” “For two,” says he, “shall be one flesh, but he which is joined to the Lord is one spirit.” Now look at the facts of the position, showing the true relation of the believer to Christ. It is illustrated under the figure of marriage. The design of this figure is to show that the believer becomes one with Christ; and the apostle further explains, in reproof of the Corinthians mingling with idolaters and adulterers, that by this mingling they become assimilated and identical. He brings up an illustration

that if a man is married to a harlot, not simply joined, but cohabit with or married to a harlot, he becomes identical with her; in other words, one flesh.

There is a passage which declares that "a bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife." It is asserted that he must have one wife anyhow and as many more as he pleases. It is supposed that this very caution indicates the prevalence of polygamy in that day; but no proof can be brought to bear that polygamy prevailed extensively at that time; on the contrary, I am prepared to prove that polygamists were not admitted into the Christian Church, for Paul lays down the positive command: "Let every man have his own wife and every woman have her own husband;" so that if you say the former applies to the priest, and the latter applies to the layman, what is good for the priest is good for the layman, and *vice versa*.

How often is it asserted here that monogamy has come from the Greeks and Romans? But look at the palpable contradiction in the assertion. It is asserted that monogamy came from those nations; it is also asserted that polygamy was universal at the time of Christ and his apostles. If monogamy came from the Greeks and Romans, then polygamy could not have been universally prevalent, for it is admitted that at that time the Romans held universal sway, and wherever they held sway their laws prevailed, hence the two statements cannot be reconciled.

Now we come to the words of the Savior, Matthew v, 27 and 28; and xix, 8 and 9, and Mark x, and 11 and 12. At that time, when the Savior was discoursing with the Pharisees, as recorded in Matthew xix, the Jews were divided as to the interpretation of the law of Moses touching divorce: "when a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it comes to pass that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement." Upon the meaning of the word uncleanness, the Jews differed: some agreed with the school of Rabbi Hillel: that a man might dismiss his wife for the slightest offence, or for no offence at all, if he found another woman that pleased him better; but the school of Rabbi Shammai held that the term uncleanness means moral delinquency. The Pharisees came to Christ, hoping to involve him in this controversy; he declined, but took advantage of the opportunity to give them a discourse on marriage, and in doing so, he refers to the original institution, saying, "have ye not read that in the beginning God made them male and female?" Thus he brings out the great law of monogamy. Grant that the allusion is incidental, nevertheless, it is all-important as falling from the lips of the Great Master.

I was challenged to show that polygamy is adultery. The gentleman challenged me, and I will now proceed to prove it. As adultery is distinguished in Scripture from whoredom and fornication, it is proper to ascertain the exact meaning of the words as used by the sacred writers. The word translated whoredom is from the Hebrew verb *Zanah* and the Greek *Pornica*, and means pollution, defilement, lewdness, prostitution and, in common parlance,

whoredom, the prostitution of the body for gain. The word translated fornication is from the same Hebrew verb, and in general, signifies criminal, sexual intercourse without the formalities of marriage. Adultery is from the Hebrew word *Naaph* and the Greek word *Moicheia*, and is the criminal intercourse of a married woman with another man than her husband, or of a married man with any other woman than his wife. This is indicated by the philological significance of the term *adulterate*, compounded of two words meaning *to another*, as the addition of pure and impure liquors, or of an alloy with pure metal. Adulterer is from the Hebrew *Naaph* and the Greek *Moichos*, which mean as above.

The material question to be settled is. Is the Hebrew word *Naaph* and the Greek word *Moichos* or *Moicheia* confined to the criminal sexual intercourse between a man, married or unmarried, with a married woman? This is the theory of the Mormon polygamists; but I join issue with them and assert that the Scriptures teach that adultery is committed by a married man who has sexual intercourse with a woman other than his wife, whether said woman is married or unmarried. It is conceded that he is an *adulterer* who has carnal connection with a woman married or betrothed. Thus far we agree.

Now can it be proved that the sin of adultery is committed by a married man having carnal connection with a woman neither married nor *betrothed*? To prove this point I argue:

*First*, that the Hebrew word *Naaph*, translated in the seventh commandment, adultery, does include all criminal sexual intercourse. It is a generic term and the whole includes the parts. It is like the word kill in the sixth commandment, which includes all those passions and emotions of the human soul which lead to murder, such as jealousy, envy, malice, hatred, revenge. So this word *Naaph* includes whoredom, fornication, adultery, and even salacious lust. Matthew v, 27, 29.

*Second*. The terms adultery and fornication are used interchangeably by our Lord, and mean the same thing. A *married woman* copulating with a man other than her husband is admitted to be adultery, but the highest authority we can bring forward calls the act fornication. Matthew v, 3, 2. Romans vii, 2, 3. 1st Corinthians vii, 1, 4.

*Third*. The carnal connection of a man with an unmarried woman is positively declared to be adultery in God's holy word. It is so recorded in Job xxiv, from the 15th to the 21st verse; and in Isaiah lvii and 3rd it is taught that the adulterer commits his sin with the whore. Therefore I conclude that the term *Naaph*, as used in the seventh commandment, comprehends all those modifications of that crime, down to the salacious lust that a man may feel in his soul for a woman.

But it may be asked: If this is so, why then, does the Mosiac law mention a married woman? We deny that such a distinction is made. We do admit, however, that special penalties were pronounced on such an action with a married woman, but for special reasons. What were they? To preserve the genealogy, parentage

and birth of Christ from interruption and confusion, which were in imminent danger when intercourse with a married woman was had by a man other than her husband. And no such danger could arise from the intercourse with a married man with an unmarried woman. That law was temporary, and was abolished and passed away when Christ came. Under the Jewish dispensation he that cohabited with a woman other than his wife was responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment; the woman was also responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment and this special law. But here you say if this be true, then some great men in Bible times were guilty of the violation of the seventh commandment. I say they were; but they were not all polygamists: that I have demonstrated to you to-day. But take the facts: Abraham, when convinced of his sin, put away Hagar; Jacob lived several years out of the state of polygamy; David put away all his wives eight years before he died; and if there is no account that Solomon put away his, neither is there the assurance that he abandoned his idolatry.

This then, my friend, is the argument; and as a Christian minister, desiring only your good, I proclaim the fact that polygamy is adultery. I do it in all kindness, but I assert it as a doctrine taught in the Bible.

I am challenged again to prove that polygamy is no prevention of prostitution. It has been affirmed time and time again, not only in this discussion, but in the written works of these distinguished gentlemen around me, that in monogamic countries prostitution, or what is known as the social evil, is almost universally prevalent. I perceive that I have not time to follow out this in argument; but I am prepared to prove, and I will prove it in your daily papers, that prostitution is as old as authentic history; that prostitution has been and is to-day more prevalent in polygamic countries than in monogamic countries. I can prove that the figures representing prostitution in monogamic countries are all overdrawn. They are overdrawn in regard to my native city, that the gentleman brought up, New York, and of the million and over of population he can not find six thousand recorded prostitutes. I can go, for instance to St. Louis, where they have just taken the census of the prostitutes of that city, and with a population of three hundred thousand, there are but 650 courtesans. You may go through the length and breadth of this land, and in villages containing from one thousand to ten thousand inhabitants, you cannot find a house of prostitution. The truth is, my friends, they would not allow it for a moment. Those men who assert that our monogamous country is full of prostitutes put forth a slander upon our country.

Our distinguished friend referred to religious liberty, and claimed that he had a right under the Federal Constitution to enjoy religious liberty and to practise polygamy. I am proud as he is that we have religious liberty here. I rejoice that a man can worship God after his own heart; but I affirm that the law of limitation is no less applicable to religious liberty than it is to the revolution of the heavenly bodies. The law of limitation is as universal as

creation, and religious liberty must be practised within the bounds of decency, and the well being of society; and civil authority may extend or restrict this religious liberty within due bounds. Why, the Hindoo mother may come here with her Shasta—with her bible—and she may throw her babe into your river or lake, and the civil authorities, according to your theory, could not interpose and say to that mother, “You shall not do it.” That is the theory. You say it is murder, I say it is not. I say the act is stripped of the attributes of murder; it is a religious act. She turns to her bible or Shasta, and says: “I am commanded to do this by my bible.” What will you do? You will turn away from the Shasta and say, “The interests of society demand that you shall not murder that child.” So civil government has a right to legislate in regard to marriage, and restrict the number of wives to one, according to God’s law. But I am not an advocate of stringent legislation. I agree with my friend, that the law should not incarcerate men, women and children in dungeons! No, my friends, if I can say a word to induce humane and kind legislation toward the people of Utah, I shall do it, and do it most gladly. But I assert this principal, that civil government has the right to limit religious liberty within due bounds.

There was another point that I desired to touch upon, and that is as to the longevity of nations. We are told repeatedly here, in printed works, that monogamic nations are short-lived, and that polygamic nations are long-lived. I am prepared to go back to the days of Nimrod, come down to the days of Ninus Sardanapalus, and down to the days of Cyrus the Great, and all through those ancient polygamic nations, and show that they were short-lived; while on the other hand I am prepared to prove that Greece and Rome outlived the longest-lived polygamic nations of the past. Greece, from the days of Homer, down to the third century of the Christian era; and Rome at from seven hundred and fifty years before the coming of Christ down to the dissolution of the old empire. But that old empire finds a resurrection in the Italians under Victor Emanuel and Garibaldi; and England, Germany and France are all proofs of the longevity of monogamic nations. Babylon is a ruin to-day, and Babylon was polygamic. Egypt, to-day, is a ruin! Her massy piles of ruin bespeak her former glory and her pristine beauty. And the last addition of the polygamic nations—Turkey—is passing away. From the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, from the Danube, and the Jordan and the Nile, the power of Mahommedanism is passing away before the advance of the monogamic nations of the old world. Our own country is just in its youth; but monogamic as it is, it is destined to live on, to outlive the hoary past, to live on in its greatness, in its beneficence, in its power; to live on until it has demonstrated all those great problems committed to our trust for human rights, religion, liberty and the advancement of the race.

My friends, these are the arguments in favor of monogamy; and when they can be overthrown, then it will be time enough for us to receive the system of polygamy as it is taught here. But un-

til that great law that we have quoted can be proved to be not a law; until it can be proved that there is no distinction between law and practice; until it can be proved that there is a positive command for polygamy; until it can be proved that Christ did not refer to the original marriage; until it can be proved that Paul does not demand that every man shall have his own wife and every woman her own husband; until it can be proved that polygamy is a prevention of prostitution; until it can be proved that monogamic nations are not as long-lived as polygamous nations; until it can be proved that monogamy is not in harmony with civil liberty; until all these points can be demonstrated beyond a doubt; until then, we can't give up this grand idea that God's law condemns polygamy, and that God's law commends monogamy; that the highest interests of man, that the dearest interests of the rising generation, that all that binds us to earth and points us to heaven are not subserved and promoted under the monogamic system. All these great interests demand the practice of monogamy in marriage—one man and one wife. Then indeed shall be realized the picture portrayed in Scripture of the happy family—the family where the wife is one and the husband one, and the two are equivalent; then, when father and mother, centered in the family, shall bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord—when the husband provides for his family—and it is said that the man who does not is worse than an infidel—then, indeed, monogamy stands forth as a grand Bible doctrine.



# DR. NEWMAN'S

## MARGINAL LAW.

---

"And thou shalt not take *one wife to another*, to vex her, etc." Marginal reading, Leviticus xviii. 18.

In a letter of Rev. Dr. Newman, published in this city on the 20th inst., he labors very hard to bring together and patch up the demolished and tattered fragments of his great fundamental *marginal law* against polygamy. Having noticed the great stress laid upon this *marginal reading* in his Washington sermon, I was in great hopes that he would again introduce it in the discussion. To call him out and give him confidence in appealing to the *margin*, in my opening speech I purposely referred to a non-essential *marginal reading* in the 25th of Deuteronomy. This had the desired effect; for on the next day, the Rev. Dr. assumed the *marginal reading* given above, as the great constitutional law, before which all other laws relating to plural marriage were to be nullified and vanish away like smoke; he made it the grand standard,—the foundation of nearly all his future arguments, during the discussion.

On the third day, a few minutes were occupied in comparing his marginal law with the original Hebrew, showing that the marginal reading was false, and could not for a moment stand the test of the original. But being limited in time, the arguments were necessarily very brief. I now purpose to examine this unwarranted reading in the margin in greater detail, and expose still further its falsity, and establish the correctness of the version, given in the text by the English translators.

The phrase, *ishah el-ahotah*, is translated in the text "*a wife to her sister*:" this is the proper, legitimate, literal rendering of each word. When *ishah* (woman, wife) is followed by *ahot* (sister), the phrase may, under certain circumstances, have two renderings.

*First:* When the persons or beings in the feminine gender, to be coupled together, are not expressed, a *literal translation* is necessary to show what class of persons, (such as near kinswomen,



aunts, cousins, nieces, sisters, etc.) shall or shall not be joined together; otherwise the sentence would be vague or uncertain.

*Second* : When Hebrew feminine nouns represent inanimate objects, such as "curtains," "loops," "tenons," "wings," etc., (see Exodus, xxvi : 3, 5, 17, Ezekiel, i : 9, 23 ; iii, 13,) a literal translation would entirely destroy the meaning. How very absurd it would be to represent one curtain as *a wife* coupled to *her sister* curtain, or one loop as *a wife* to take hold of *her sister* loop, or one tenon as *a wife* set in order against *her sister* tenon. To avoid these absurdities, an idiomatic rendering of the phrase, *ishah el-ahotah* is permitted, namely, *ishah* (one) *el-ahotah* (to another.) If the Hebrew phrase, in the text, take this second form, it would read,

Neither shalt thou take—one to another.

As the blank is unknown, and as there are no original words to represent the prohibited relationship, every one is left to substitute such a phrase as may seem to be most in accordance with the law contained in the twelve preceding verses. Let us fill up the blank with a few specimens, and see if we can conjecture which is the most correct :

1. Neither shalt thou take (sisters) one to another.
2. Neither shalt thou take (aunts) one to another.
3. Neither shalt thou take (nieces) one to another.
4. Neither shalt thou take (cousins) one to another.
5. Neither shalt thou take (near kins-women) one to another.
6. Neither shalt thou take (wives) one to another.

The first five substitutions represent blood relations, while the last does not. There is therefore a much greater probability that any one of the first five may be the true meaning, than that the last should be correct. But why should the law rest upon this great uncertainty, when the first literal rendering of the English translators, gives it a definite, plain meaning that no one can misunderstand ?

I shall next proceed to show that the English translators have, in a majority of cases, given the *literal* rendering, instead of the *idiomatic* to the masculine form of the phrase "*one—another*." The masculine form is *ish el akhiv* signifying "*a man to his brother*," translated thus : *ish* (a man) *el akhiv* (to his brother.) The suffix *iv* stands for the possessive pronoun *his* ; while *akh* stands for *brother*. When *ish* is followed by *akh*, the first (like the feminine form) is sometimes translated *one*, the second sometimes rendered *another*. This idiomatic rendering is, indeed, absolutely necessary when the masculine Hebrew nouns to be coupled together represent inanimate objects. For instance, the noun, *faces*, of the inanimate cherubim placed over the mercy seat, is in Hebrew a masculine noun. (See Exodus, xxv. 20.) "And their faces shall look one to another." Also Exodus xxxvii : 9. "With their faces one to another." This could not be literally translated without manifesting the greatest absurdity. But in all other passages, the masculine phrase *ish el akhiv* represents masculine persons, and is translated to the majority of cases literally. It may not be amiss to observe that the preposition, joining *ish—akhiv*, is not always *el* ; the prefixes *l*, *k*, *b*, are

often used to express different kinds of prepositions. The phrase *ish—ahhiv*, with its coupling preposition, occurs, at least, twenty-eight times in the Old Testament, thirteen of which are translated in the idiomatic form, *one—another*; the remaining fifteen are translated literally, “*man—his brother*.” I will give a few specimens:

Nehemiah, v : 7. “Ye exact usury, every one of his brother.”

Isaiah iii : 6. “When a man shall take hold of his brother.”

Isaiah ix : 19. “No man shall spare his brother.”

Isaiah xix : 2. “And they shall fight every one against his brother.”

Isaiah xii : 6. “And every one said to his brother.”

Jeremiah xxiii : 35. “And every one to his brother.”

Jeremiah xxxi : 34. “And every man his brother.”

Jeremiah xxxiv : 14. “Every man his brother.”

Jeremiah xxxiv : 17. “Every one to his brother.”

Jeremiah xiii : 14. “And I will dash them one against another.”

If it were necessary we might quote the phrases in the twenty-eight passages where they occur in a masculine form: but these are sufficient to show that King James’ translators used both the literal and the idiomatic forms of translation in both the masculine and feminine forms of the Hebrew phrase which occurs in Leviticus xviii : 18. The literal translation of the feminine form occurs only once; and this arises from the singular fact that the feminine phrase occurs only once in the Hebrew, as connected with and applied to living persons in the feminine gender. Another remarkable fact, connected with the phrase in Leviticus, is, that it is the only instance out of thirty-six cases in the two genders, where the nouns or things to be coupled together are not expressed; and for this very reason it seemed to be absolutely necessary to give the literal rendering as found in the text.

Thus we have found that the marginal reading is not only false, by an unwarranted substitution of the word “wife,” but its idiomatic form also cannot be given and make sense. And therefore the text stands out in all its brightness and purity, as an everlasting condemnation of Newman’s marginal law.

#### DR. NEWMAN’S INCORRECT HEBREW.

In the last day’s discussion, I devoted a few moments in showing the falsity of Dr. Newman’s rendering of the Hebrew word, translated “duty of marriage.” (See Exodus xxi : 10.) He acknowledges that all the ancient and modern Hebrew Lexicons, and “all the ancient and venerable translators of the Septuagint—the famous Greek version of the Old Testament.” \* \* \* “Say the word here means cohabitation.” But the learned Doctor is not satisfied with this whole army of translators, renowned for their wisdom and learning. He has consulted a Jewish Rabbi in Washington, whose opinion he thinks outweighs all others in deciphering the Hebrew word for “*dwelling*.” He believes that he has discovered a word translated “*dwelling*,” which resembles in some points of its orthography the Hebrew word for “cohabitation” or “duty of marriage.”

But let me inform the reverend gentleman that the two Hebrew words are as distinct in their orthography as the English words *unkind* and *mankind*, or *history* and *mystery*. The Hebrew for "*cohabitation*" commences with the letter *ayin*; the Hebrew for "*dwelling*" commences with the letter *mem*: the first has two syllables; the second has three syllables; the former is spelled *onah*; the latter *meonah*. It cannot be proved from any Hebrew Lexicon or Grammar that I have consulted that the two words are derived from the same verbal root; and even if this could be proved, it would be no evidence that their meanings or definitions were the same; for there are great numbers of different nouns whose derivations may be traced back to a common root, and yet their definitions are as distinct as "*cohabitation*" and "*dwelling*." Neither Mr. Newman, nor his Jewish Rabbi, can find one iota of proof in the original Hebrew to substantiate their unwarranted assumption that the two words are one and the same. Therefore, the eminent Hebrew and Greek scholars, both of ancient and modern times, are still to be believed when they emphatically tell us that the word in the text rendered "*duty of marriage*" means "*cohabitation*." Hence God's own law reads:

"If he take him another *wife*: her food, her raiment, and her duty of cohabitation shall he not diminish."

This shows, most emphatically, that the betrothal of the first was consummated in marriage, and that this special duty of marriage must not be diminished.

ORSON PRATT, SEN.

*Salt Lake City, August 26th, 1870.*



DISCOURSE

ON

CELESTIAL MARRIAGE,

DELIVERED BY

ELDER ORSON PRATT,

IN THE

NEW TABERNACLE, SALT LAKE CITY, OCTOBER 7TH, 1869.

---

It was announced at the close of the forenoon meeting that I would address the congregation this afternoon upon the subject of Celestial Marriage ; I do so with the greatest pleasure.

In the first place, let us enquire whether it is lawful and right, according to the Constitution of our country, to examine and practice this Bible Doctrine ? Our fathers, who framed the Constitution of our country, devised it so as to give freedom of religious worship of the Almighty God ; so that all people under our Government should have the inalienable right—a right by virtue of the Constitution—to believe in any Bible principle which the Almighty has revealed in any age of the world to the human family. I do not think, however, that our forefathers, in framing that instrument, intended to embrace all the religions of the world. I mean the idolatrous and pagan religions. They say nothing about those religions in the Constitution ; but they give the express privilege in that instrument to all people dwelling under this Government and under the institutions of our country, to believe in all things which the Almighty has revealed to the human family. There is no restriction or limitation, so far as Bible religion is concerned, on any principle or form of religion believed to have emanated from the Almighty ; but yet they would not admit idolatrous nations to come here and practice their religion, because it is not included in the Bible ; it is not the religion of the Almighty. Those people worship idols, the work of their own hands ; they have instituted rites and ceremonies pertaining to those idols, in the observance of which they, no doubt, suppose they are worshipping correctly and sincerely, yet some of them are of the most revolting and barbarous character. Such, for instance,

as the offering up of a widow on a funeral pile, as a burnt sacrifice, in order to follow her husband into the eternal worlds. That is no part of the religion mentioned in the Constitution of our country, it is no part of the religion of Almighty God,

But confining ourselves within the limits of the Constitution, and coming back to the religion of the Bible, we have the privilege to believe in the Patriarchal, in the Mosiac, or in the Christian order of things; for the God of the patriarchs, and the God of Moses is also the Christian's God.

It is true that many laws were given, under the Patriarchal or Mosiac dispensations, against certain crimes, the penalties for violating which, religious bodies, under our Constitution, have not the right to inflict. The Government has reserved in its own hands the power, so far as affixing the penalties of certain crimes is concerned.

In ancient times there was a law strictly enforcing the observance of the Sabbath day, and the man or woman who violated that law was subject to the punishment of death. Ecclesiastical bodies have the right, under our government and Constitution, to observe the Sabbath day, or to disregard it, but they have not the right to inflict corporeal punishment for its non-observance.

The subject proposed to be investigated this afternoon is that of Celestial Marriage, as believed in by the Latter-day Saints, and which they claim is strictly a Bible doctrine and part of the revealed religion of the Almighty. It is well known by all the Latter-day Saints that we have not derived all our knowledge concerning God, heaven, angels, this life and the life to come, entirely from the books of the Bible; yet we believe that all our religious principles and notions are in accordance with and are sustained by the Bible; consequently, though we believe in new revelation, and believe that God has revealed many things pertaining to our religion, we also believe that he has revealed none that are inconsistent with the worship of Almighty God, a sacred right guaranteed to all religious denominations by the Constitution of our country.

God created man, male and female. He is the author of our existence. He placed us on this creation. He ordained laws to govern us. He gave to man, whom he created, a help-meet—a woman, a wife, to be one with him, to be a joy and a comfort to him; and also for another very great and wise purpose—namely, that the human species might be propagated on this creation, that the earth might teem with population, according to the decree of God before the foundation of the world, that the intelligent spirits whom he had formed and created, before this world was rolled into existence, might have their probation, might have an existence in fleshly bodies on this planet, and be governed by laws emanating from their Great Creator. In the breast of male and female he established certain qualities and attributes that never will be eradicated—namely, love towards each other. Love comes from God. The love which man possesses for the opposite sex came from God. The same God who created the two sexes implanted in the hearts of each love towards the other. What was the object of placing this

passion or affection within the hearts of male and female? It was in order to carry out, so far as this world was concerned, his great and eternal purposes pertaining to the future. But he not only did establish this principle in the heart of man and woman, but gave divine laws to regulate them in relation to this passion or affection, that they might be limited and prescribed in the exercise of it towards each other. He therefore ordained the Marriage Institution. The marriage that was instituted in the first place was between two immortal beings, hence it was marriage for eternity in the very first case which we have recorded for example. Marriage for eternity was the order God instituted on our globe; as early as the Garden of Eden, as early as the day when our first parents were placed in the garden to keep it and till it, they, as two immortal beings, were united in the bonds of the New and Everlasting Covenant. This was before man fell, before the forbidden fruit was eaten, and before the penalty of death was pronounced upon the heads of our first parents and all their posterity; hence, when God gave to Adam his wife Eve, he gave her to him as an immortal wife, and there was no end contemplated of the relation they held to each other as husband and wife.

By and bye, after this marriage had taken place, they transgressed the law of God, and by reason of that transgression the penalty of death came, not only upon them, but also upon all their posterity. Death, in its operations, tore asunder, as it were, these two beings who had hitherto been immortal, and if God had not, before the foundation of the world, provided a plan of redemption, they would perhaps have been torn asunder for ever; but inasmuch as a plan of redemption had been provided, by which man could be rescued from the effects of the Fall, Adam and Eve were restored to that condition of union, in respect to immortality, from which they had been separated for a short season of time by death. The Atonement reached after them and brought forth their bodies from the dust, and restored them as husband and wife, to all the privileges that were pronounced upon them before the Fall.

That was eternal marriage; that was lawful marriage ordained by God. That was the divine institution which was revealed and practised in the early period of our globe. How has it been since that day? Mankind have strayed from that order of things, or, at least, they have done so in latter times. We hear nothing among the religious societies of the world, which profess to believe in the Bible, about this marriage for eternity. It is among the things which are obsolete. Now all marriages are consummated until death only; they do not believe in that great pattern and prototype established in the beginning; hence we never hear of their official characters, whether civil or religious, uniting men and women in the capacity of husband and wife as immortal beings. No, they marry as mortal beings only, and until death does them part.

What is to become of them after death? What will take place among all those nations who have been marrying for centuries for time only? Do both men and women receive a resurrection? Do they come forth with all the various affections, attributes and pas-

sions that God gave them in the beginning? Does the male come forth from the grave with all the attributes of a man? Does the female come forth from her grave with all the attributes of a woman? If so, what is their future destiny? Is there no object or purpose in this new creation save to give them life, a state of existence? Or is there a more important object in view in the mind of God, in thus creating them anew? Will that principle of love which exists now, and which has existed from the beginning, exist after the resurrection? I mean this sexual love. If that existed before the Fall, and if it has existed since then, will it exist in the eternal worlds after the resurrection? This is a very important question to be decided.

We read in the revelations of God that there are various classes of beings in the eternal worlds. There are some who are kings, priests, and Gods, others that are angels; and also among them are the orders denominated celestial, terrestrial, and telestial. God, however, according to the faith of the Latter-day Saints, has ordained that the highest order and class of beings that should exist in the eternal worlds should exist in the capacity of husbands and wives, and that they alone should have the privilege of propagating their species—intelligent, immortal beings. Now it is wise, no doubt, in the Great Creator to thus limit this great and heavenly principle to those who have arrived or come to the highest state of exaltation, excellency, wisdom, knowledge, power, glory and faithfulness, to dwell in his presence, that they by this means shall be prepared to bring up their spirit offspring in all pure and holy principles in the eternal worlds, in order that they may be made happy. Consequently he does not intrust this privilege of multiplying spirits with the terrestrial or telestial, or the lower order of beings there, nor with angels. But why not? Because they have not proved themselves worthy of this great privilege. We might reason of the eternal worlds, as some of the enemies of polygamy reason of this state of existence, and say that there are just as many males as females there, some celestial, some terrestrial and some telestial; and why not have all these paired off, two by two? Because God administers his gifts and his blessings to those who are most faithful, giving them more bountifully to the faithful, and taking away from the unfaithful that with which they have been entrusted, and which they have not improved upon. That is the order of God in the eternal worlds, and if such an order exists there, it may in a degree exist here.

When the sons and daughters of the Most High God come forth in the morning of the resurrection, this principle of love will exist in their bosoms just as it exists here, only intensified according to the increased knowledge and understanding which they possess; hence they will be capacitated to enjoy the relationships of husband and wife, of parents and children, a hundred fold degree greater than they could in mortality. We are not capable, while surrounded with the weaknesses of our flesh, to enjoy these eternal principles in the same degree that will then exist. Shall these principles of conjugal and parental love and affection be thwarted in

the eternal worlds? Shall they be rooted out and overcome? No, most decidedly not. According to the religious notions of the world these principles will not exist after the resurrection; but our religion teaches the fallacy of such notions. It is true that we read in the New Testament that in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven. These are the words of our Saviour when he was addressing himself to a very wicked class of people, the Sadducees, a portion of the Jewish nation, who rejected Jesus, and the counsel of God against their own souls. They had not attained to the blessings and privileges of their fathers, but had apostatized; and Jesus, in speaking to them, says that in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God.

I am talking, to-day, to Latter-day Saints; I am not reasoning with unbelievers. If I were I should appeal more fully to the Old Testament Scriptures to bring in arguments and testimonies to prove the divine authenticity of polygamic marriages. Perhaps I may touch upon this for a few moments, for the benefit of strangers, should there be any in our midst. Let me say, then, that God's people, under every dispensation since the creation of the world, have, generally, been polygamists. I say this for the benefit of strangers. According to the good old book, called the Bible, when God saw proper to call out Abraham from all the heathen nations, and made him a great man in the world, he saw proper, also, to make him a polygamist, and approbated him in taking unto himself more wives than one. Was it wrong in Abraham to do this thing? If it were, when did God reprove him for so doing? When did he ever reproach Jacob for doing the same thing? Who can find the record in the lids of the Bible of God reproving Abraham, as being a sinner, and having committed a crime, in taking to himself two living wives? No such thing is recorded. He was just as much blessed after doing this thing as before, and more so, for God promised blessings upon the issue of Abraham by his second wife the same as that of the first wife, providing he was equally faithful. This was a proviso in every case.

When we come down to Jacob, the Lord permitted him to take four wives. They are so called in holy writ. They are not denominated prostitutes, neither are they called concubines; but they are called wives, legal wives; and to show that God approved of the course of Jacob in taking these wives, he blessed them abundantly, and hearkened to the prayer of the second wife just the same as to the first. Rachel was the second wife of Jacob, and our great mother, for you know that many of the Latter-day Saints by revelation know themselves to be the descendants of Joseph, and he was the son of Rachel, the second wife of Jacob. God in a peculiar manner blessed the posterity of this second wife. Instead of condemning the old patriarch, he ordained that Joseph, the first-born of this second wife, should be considered the first-born of all the twelve tribes, and into his hands was given the double birthright, according to the laws of the ancients. And yet he was the offspring of plurality—of the second wife of Jacob. Of course, if Reuben,



who was indeed the first-born unto Jacob, had conducted himself properly, he might have retained the birthright and the great inheritance; but he lost that through his transgression, and it was given to a polygamic child, who had the privilege of inheriting the blessing to the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills; the great continent of North and South America was conferred upon him. Another proof that God did not disapprove of a man having more wives than one is to be found in the fact that Rachel, after she had been a long time barren, prayed to the Lord to give her seed. The Lord hearkened to her cry and granted her prayer; and when she received seed from the Lord by her polygamic husband, she exclaimed—"The Lord hath hearkened unto me and hath answered my prayer." Now do you think the Lord would have done this if he had considered polygamy a crime? Would he have hearkened to the prayer of this woman if Jacob had been living with her in adultery? and he certainly was doing so if the ideas of this generation are correct.

Again, what says the Lord, in the days of Moses, under another dispensation? We have seen that in the days of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, he approved of polygamy and blessed his servants who practised it, and also their wives and children. Now, let us come down to the days of Moses. We read that, on a certain occasion, the sister of Moses, Miriam, and certain others in the great congregation of Israel, got very jealous. What were they jealous about? About the Ethiopian woman that Moses had taken to wife, in addition to the daughter of Jethro, whom he had taken before in the land of Midian. How dare the great law-giver, after having committed, according to the ideas of the present generation, a great crime, show his face on Mount Sinai when it was clothed with the glory of the God of Israel? But what did the Lord do in the case of Miriam, for finding fault with her brother Moses? Instead of saying, "You are right, Miriam, he has committed a great crime, and no matter how much you speak against him," he smote her with a leprosy the very moment she began to complain, and she was considered unclean for a certain number of days. Here the Lord manifested, by the display of a signal judgment, that he disapproved of any one speaking against his servants for taking more wives than one, because it may not happen to suit their notion of things.

I make these remarks and wish to apply them to fault-finders against plural marriages in our day. Are there any Miriams in our congregation to-day, any of those who, professing to belong to the Israel of the latter-days, sometimes find fault with the man of God standing at their head, because he not only believes in but practises this divine institution of the ancients? If there be such in our midst, I say, remember Miriam, the very next time you begin to talk with your neighboring women, or any body else against this holy principle. Remember the awful curse and judgment that fell on the sister of Moses when she did the same thing, and then fear and tremble before God, least he, in his wrath, may swear that you shall not enjoy the blessings ordained for those who inherit the highest degree of glory.

Let us pass along to another instance under the dispensation of Moses. The Lord says, on a certain occasion, if a man have married two wives, and he should happen to hate one and love the other, is he to be punished—cast out and stoned to death as an adulterer? No; instead of the Lord denouncing him as an adulterer because of having two wives, he gave a commandment regulating the matter, so that this principle of hate in the mind of the man towards one of his wives should not control him in the important question of the division of his inheritance among his children, compelling him to give just as much to the son of the hated wife as to the son of the one beloved; and, if the son of the hated woman happened to be the first-born, he should actually inherit the double portion.

Consequently, the Lord approved, not only the two wives, but their posterity also. Now, if the women had not been considered wives by the Lord, their children would have been bastards, and you know that he has said that bastards shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord, until the tenth generation, hence you see there is a great distinction between those whom the Lord calls legitimate or legal, and those who were bastards—begotten in adultery and whoredom. The latter, with their posterity, were shut out of the congregation of the Lord until the tenth generation, while the former were exalted to all the privileges of legitimate birthright.

Again, under that same law and dispensation, we find that the Lord provided for another contingency among the hosts of Israel. In order that the inheritances of the families of Israel might not run into the hands of strangers, the Lord, in the book of Deuteronomy, gives a command that if a man die, leaving a wife, but no issue, his brother shall marry his widow and take possession of the inheritance; and to prevent this inheritance going out of the family a strict command was given that the widow should marry the brother or nearest living kinsman of her deceased husband. The law was in full force at the time of the introduction of Christianity—a great many centuries after it was given. The reasoning of the Sadducees on one occasion when conversing with Jesus proves that the law was then observed. Said they; "There were seven brethren who all took a certain woman, each one taking her in succession after the death of the other," and they inquired of Jesus which of the seven would have her for a wife in the resurrection. The Sadducees, no doubt, used this figure to prove, as they thought, the fallacy of the doctrine of the resurrection, but it also proves that this law, given by the Creator while Israel walked acceptably before him, was acknowledged by their wicked descendants in the days of the Saviour. I merely quote the passage to show that the law was not considered obsolete at that time. A case like this, when six of the brethren had died, leaving the widow without issue, the seventh, whether married or unmarried, must fulfill this law and take the widow to wife, or lay himself liable to a very severe penalty. What was that penalty? According to the testimony of the law of Moses he would be cursed, for Moses says, "Cursed be he that doth not all things according as it is written in

this book of the law; and let all the people say Amen." There can be no doubt that many men in those days were compelled to be polygamists in the fulfillment of this law, for any man who would not take the childless wife of a deceased brother and marry her, would come under the tremendous curse recorded in the book of Deuteronomy, and all the people would be obliged to sanction the curse, because he would not obey the law of God and become a polygamist. They were not all congressmen in those days, nor Presidents, nor Presbyterians, nor Methodists, nor Roman Catholics; but they were the people of God, governed by divine law, and were commanded to be polygamists; not merely suffered to be so, but actually commanded to be.

There are some Latter-day Saints who, perhaps, have not searched these things as they ought, hence we occasionally find some who will say that God suffered these things to be. I will go further, and say that he commanded them, and he pronounced a curse, to which all the people had to say amen, if they did not fulfill the commandment.

Coming down to the days of the prophets we find that they were polygamists; also to the days of the kings of Israel, whom God appointed himself, and approbated and blessed. This was especially the case with one of them, named David, who, the Lord said, was a man after his own heart. David was called when yet a youth, to reign over the whole twelve tribes of Israel. But Saul, the reigning king of Israel, persecuted him, and sought to take away his life. David fled from city to city, throughout all the coasts of Judea, in order to get beyond the reach of the relentless persecutions of Saul. While thus fleeing, the Lord was with him, hearing his prayers, answering his petitions, giving him line upon line, precept upon precept, permitting him to look into the Urim and Thummim and receive revelations, which enabled him to escape from his enemies.

In addition to all these blessings that God bestowed upon him in his youth, before he was exalted to the throne, he gave him eight wives; and after exalting him to the throne, instead of denouncing him for having many wives, and pronouncing him worthy of fourteen or twenty-one years of imprisonment, the Lord was with his servant David, and, thinking he had not wives enough, he gave to him all the wives of his master Saul, in addition to the eight he had previously given him. Was the Lord to be considered a criminal, and worthy of being tried in a court of justice and sent to prison, for thus increasing the polygamic relations of David? No, certainly not; it was in accordance with his own righteous laws, and he was with his servant, David the king, and blessed him. By and by, when David transgressed, not in taking other wives, but in taking the wife of another man, the anger of the Lord was kindled against him and he chastened him and took away all the blessings he had given him. All the wives David had received from the hand of God were taken from him. Why? Because he had committed adultery. Here then is a great distinction between adultery

and plurality of wives. One brings honor and blessing to those who engage in it, the other degradation and death.

After David had repented with all his heart of his crime with the wife of Uriah, he, notwithstanding the number of wives he had previously taken, took Bathsheba legally, and by that legal marriage Solomon was born; the child born of her unto David, begotten illegally, being a bastard, displeased the Lord and he struck it with death; but with Solomon, a legal issue from the same woman, the Lord was so pleased that he ordained Solomon and set him on the throne of his father David. This shows the difference between the two classes of posterity, the one begotten illegally, the other in the order of marriage. If Solomon had been a bastard, as this pious generation would have us suppose, instead of being blessed of the Lord and raised to the throne of his father, he would have been banished from the congregation of Israel and his seed after him for ten generations. But, notwithstanding that he was so highly blessed and honored of the Lord, there was room for him to transgress and fall, and in the end he did so. For a long time the Lord blessed Solomon, but eventually he violated that law which the Lord had given forbidding Israel to take wives from the idolatrous nations, and some of these wives succeeded in turning his heart from the Lord and induced him to worship the heathen gods, and the Lord was angry with him and, as it is recorded in the Book of Mormon, considered the acts of Solomon an abomination in his sight.

Let us now come to the record in the Book of Mormon, when the Lord led forth Lehi and Nephi, and Ishmael and his two sons and five daughters out of the land of Jerusalem to the land of America. The males and females were about equal in number; there were Nephi, Sam, Laman and Lemuel, the four sons of Lehi, and Zoram, brought out of Jerusalem. How many daughters of Ishmael were unmarried? Just five. Would it have been just, under these circumstances, to ordain plurality among them? No. Why? Because the males and females were equal in number and they were all under the guidance of the Almighty, hence it would have been unjust, and the Lord gave a revelation—the only one on record I believe—in which a command was ever given to any branch of Israel to be confined to the monogamic system. In this case the Lord, through his servant Lehi, gave a command that they should have but one wife. The Lord had a perfect right to vary his commands in this respect according to circumstances, as he did in others, as recorded in the Bible. There we find that the domestic relations were governed according to the mind and will of God, and were varied according to circumstances, as he thought proper.

By and by, after the death of Lehi, some of his posterity began to disregard the strict law that God had given to their father, and took more wives than one, and the Lord put them in mind, through his servant Jacob, one of the sons of Lehi, of this law, and told them that they were transgressing it, and then referred to David and Solomon, as having committed abomination in his sight. The Bible also tells us that they sinned in the sight of God; not in tak-

ing wives legally, but only in those they took illegally, in doing which they brought wrath and condemnation upon their heads.

But because the Lord dealt thus with the small branch of the House of Israel that came to America, under their peculiar circumstances, there are those at the present day who will appeal to this passage in the Book of Mormon as something universally applicable in regard to man's domestic relations. The same God that commanded one branch of the House of Israel in America, to take but one wife when the numbers of the two sexes were about equal, gave a different command to the hosts of Israel in Palestine. But let us see the qualifying clause given in the Book of Mormon on this subject. After having reminded the people of the commandment delivered by Lehi, in regard to monogamy, the Lord says—"For if I will raise up seed unto me I will command my people, otherwise they shall hearken unto these things;" that is, if I will raise up seed among my people of the House of Israel, according to the law that exists among the tribes of Israel, I will give them a commandment on the subject, but if I do not give this commandment they shall hearken to the law which I give unto their father Lehi. That is the meaning of the passage, and this very passage goes to prove that plurality was a principle God did approve under circumstances when it was authorized by him.

In the early rise of this church, February, 1831, God gave a commandment to its members, recorded in the Book of Covenants, wherein he says—"Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shalt cleave unto her and none else;" and then he gives a strict law against adultery. This you have, no doubt, all read; but let me ask whether the Lord had the privilege and the right to vary from this law. It was given in 1831, when the one-wife system alone prevailed among this people. I will tell you what the Prophet Joseph said in relation to this matter in 1831, also in 1832, the year in which the law commanding the members of this church to cleave to one wife only was given. Joseph was then living in Portage County, in the town of Hyrum, at the house of Father John Johnson. Joseph was very intimate with that family, and they were good people at that time, and enjoyed much of the Spirit of the Lord. In the forepart of the year 1832, Joseph told individuals, then in the Church, that he had enquired of the Lord concerning the principle of plurality of wives, and he received for answer that the principle of taking more wives than one was a true principle, but the time had not yet come for it to be practised. That was before the church was two years old. The Lord has his own time to do all things pertaining to his purposes in the last dispensation, his own time for restoring all things that have been predicted by the ancient prophets. If they had predicted that the day would come when seven women would take hold of one man, saying, "We will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach;" and that, in that day the branch of the Lord should be beautiful and glorious and the fruits of the earth should be excellent and comely, the Lord has the right to say when that time shall be.

Now supposing the members of this church had undertaken to vary from that law given in 1831, to love their one wife with all their hearts and to cleave to none other, they would have come under the curse and condemnation of God's holy law. Some twelve years after that time the revelation on Celestial Marriage was revealed. This is just republished at the DESERET NEWS office, in a pamphlet entitled "Answers to Questions," by President George A. Smith, and heretofore has been published in pamphlet form and in the *Millennial Star*, and sent throughout the length and breadth of our country, being included in our works and published in the works of our enemies. Then came the Lord's time for this holy and ennobling principle to be practised again among his people.

We have not time to read the revelation this afternoon; suffice it to say that God revealed the principle through his servant Joseph in 1843. It was known by many individuals while the Church was yet in Illinois; and though it was not then printed, it was a familiar thing through all the streets of Nauvoo, and indeed throughout all Hancock County. Did I hear about it? I verily did. Did my brethren of the Twelve know about it? They certainly did. Were there any females who knew about it? There certainly were, for some received the revelation and entered into the practice of the principle. Some may say, "Why was it not printed, and made known to the people generally, if it was of such importance?" I reply by asking another question: Why did not the revelations in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants come to us in print years before they did? Why were they shut up in Joseph's cupboard years and years without being suffered to be printed and sent broadcast throughout the land? Because the Lord had again his own time to accomplish his purposes, and he suffered the revelations to be printed just when he saw proper. He did not suffer the revelation on the great American war to be published until sometime after it was given. So in regard to the revelation on plurality, it was only a short time after Joseph's death that we published it, having a copy thereof. But what became of the original? An apostate destroyed it; you have heard her name. That same woman, in destroying the original, thought she had destroyed the revelation from the face of the earth. She was embittered against Joseph, her husband, and at times fought against him with all her heart; and then again she would break down in her feelings, and humble herself before God and call upon his holy name, and would then lead forth ladies and place their hands in the hands of Joseph, and they were married to him according to the law of God. That same woman has brought up her children to believe that no such thing as plurality of wives existed in the days of Joseph, and has instilled the bitterest principles of apostacy into their minds, to fight against the Church that has come to these mountains according to the predictions of Joseph.

In the year 1844, before his death, a large company was organized to come and search out a location, west of the Rocky Mountains. We have been fulfilling and carrying out his predictions in coming here and since our arrival. The course pursued by this

woman shows what apostates can do, and how wicked they can become in their hearts. When they apostatize from the truth they can come out and swear before God and the heavens that such and such things never existed, when they know, as well as they know they exist themselves, that they are swearing falsely. Why do they do this? Because they have no fear of God before their eyes; because they have apostatized from the truth; because they have taken it upon themselves to destroy the revelations of the Most High, and to banish them from the face of the earth, and the Spirit of God withdraws from them. We have come here to these mountains, and have continued to practise the principle of Celestial Marriage from the day the revelation was given until the present time; and we are a polygamic people, and a great people, comparatively speaking, considering the difficult circumstances under which we came to this land.

Let us speak for a few moments upon another point connected with this subject—that is, the reason why God has established polygamy under the present circumstances among this people. If all the inhabitants of the earth, at the present time, were righteous before God, and both males and females were faithful in keeping his commandments, and the numbers of the sexes of marriageable age were exactly equal, there would be no necessity for any such institution. Every righteous man could have his wife and there would be no overplus of females. But what are the facts in relation to this matter? Since old Pagan Rome and Greece—worshippers of idols—passed a law confining a man to one wife, there has been a great surplus of females, who have had no possible chance of getting married. You may think this a strange statement, but it is a fact that those nations were the founders of what is termed monogamy. All other nations, with few exceptions, had followed the scriptural plan of having more wives than one. These nations, however, were very powerful, and when Christianity came to them, especially the Roman nation, it had to bow to their mandates and customs, hence the Christians gradually adopted the monogamic system. The consequence was that a great many marriageable ladies in those days, and of all generations from that time to the present, have not had the privilege of husbands, as the one-wife system has been established by law among the nations descended from the great Roman Empire—namely, the nations of modern Europe and the American States. This law of monogamy, or the monogamic system, laid the foundation for prostitution and evils and diseases of the most revolting nature and character, under which modern Christendom groans, for as God has implanted, for a wise purpose, certain feelings in the breasts of females as well as males, the gratification of which is necessary to health and happiness, and which can only be accomplished legitimately in the married state, myriads of those who have been deprived of the privilege of entering that state, rather than be deprived of the gratification of those feelings altogether, have, in despair, given way to wickedness and licentiousness; hence the whoredoms and prostitution among the nations of the earth where the “Mother of Harlots” has her seat.

When the religious Reformers came out, some two or three centuries ago, they neglected to reform the marriage system—a subject demanding their urgent attention. But leaving these Reformers and their doings, let us come down to our own times and see whether, as has often been said by many, the numbers of the sexes are equal; and let us take as a basis for our investigations on this part of our subject, the censuses taken by several of the States in the American Union.

Many will tell us that the number of males and the number of females born are just about equal, and because they are so it is not reasonable to suppose that God ever intended the nations to practise plurality of wives. Let me say a few words on that. Supposing we should admit, for the sake of argument, that the sexes are born in equal numbers, does that prove that the same equality exists when they come to a marriageable age? By no means. There may be about equal numbers born, but what do the statistics of our country show in regard to the deaths? Do as many females as males die during the first year of their existence? If you go to the published statistics you will find, almost without exception, that in every State a greater number of males die the first year of their existence than females. The same holds good from one year to five years, from five years to ten, from ten to fifteen, and from fifteen to twenty. This shows that the number of females is greatly in excess of the males when they reach a marriageable age. Let us elucidate still further, in proof of the position here assumed. Let us take, for instance, the census of the State of Pennsylvania in the year 1860, and we shall find that there were 17,588 more females than males between the age of twenty and thirty years, which may strictly be termed a marriageable age. Says one, "Probably the great war made that difference." No, this was before the war. Now let us go to the statistics of the State of New York, before the war, and we find according to the official tables of the census taken in 1860, that there were 45,104 more females than males in that one State, between the ages of twenty and thirty years—a marriageable age, recollect. Now let us go to the State of Massachusetts and look at the statistics there. In the year 1865, there were 33,452 more females than males between the age of twenty and thirty. We might go on from State to State, and then to the census taken by the United States, and a vast surplus would be shown of females over males of a marriageable age. What is to be done with them? I will tell you what Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and New York say: they say, virtually, "We will pass a law so strict, that if these females undertake to marry a man who has another wife, both they and the men they marry shall be subject to a term of imprisonment in the penitentiary." Indeed! then what are you going to do with these hundreds of thousands of females of a marriageable age? "We are going to make them either old maids or prostitutes, and we would a little rather have them prostitutes, than we men would have no need to marry." This is the conclusion many of these marriageable males, between twenty and thirty years of age, have come to. They will not marry because the laws of the land have a tendency



to make prostitutes, and they can purchase all the animal gratification they desire without being bound to any woman; hence many of them have mistresses, by whom they raise children, and, when they get tired of them, turn both mother and children into the street, with nothing to support them, the law allowing them to do so, because the women are not wise. Thus the poor creatures are plunged into the depths of misery, wretchedness, and degradation, because at all risks they have followed the instincts implanted within them by their Creator, and not having the opportunity to do so legally have done so unlawfully. There are hundreds and thousands of females in this boasted land of liberty, through the narrow, contracted, bigoted State laws, preventing them from ever getting husbands. That is what the Lord is fighting against; we, also, are fighting against it, and for the re-establishment of the Bible religion and the Celestial or Patriarchal order of marriage.

It is no matter according to the Constitution whether we believe in the patriarchal parts of the Bible, in the Mosaic or in the Christian part: whether we believe in one-half, two thirds, or in the whole of it, that is nobody's business. The Constitution never granted power to Congress to prescribe what part of the Bible any people should believe in or reject; it never intended any such thing.

Much more might be said, but the congregation is large, and a speaker, of course, will weary. Though my voice is tolerably good, I feel weary in making a congregation of from eight to ten thousand people hear me; I have tried to do so. May God bless you, and may he pour out his spirit upon the rising generation among us, and upon the missionaries who are about to be sent to the United States, and elsewhere, that the great principles, political, religious and domestic, that God has ordained and established, may be made known to all people.

In this land of liberty in religious worship, let us boldly proclaim our right to believe in and practise any Bible precept, command or doctrine, whether in the Old or New Testament, whether relating to ceremonies, ordinances, domestic relations, or anything else, not incompatible with the rights of others, and the great revelations of Almighty God manifested in ancient and modern times. Amen.

DISCOURSE  
ON  
CELESTIAL MARRIAGE,  
DELIVERED BY  
PRESIDENT GEO. A. SMITH,  
IN THE  
NEW TABERNACLE, SALT LAKE CITY, OCTOBER 8TH, 1869.

---

It is a difficult undertaking to address this immense audience. If a man commences speaking loud, in a short time his voice gives out: whereas, if he commences rather low, he may raise his voice by degrees, and be able to sustain himself in speaking some length of time. But with children crying, a few persons whispering, and some shuffling their feet, it is indeed a difficult task to make an audience of ten thousand persons hear. I have listened with pleasure to the instructions of our brethren from the commencement of our Conference to the present time. I have rejoiced in their testimonies, I have felt that the elders are improving in wisdom, in knowledge, in power and in understanding; and I rejoice in the privilege, which we have at the present day, of sending out to our own country a few hundred of the Elders who have had experience—who have lived in Israel long enough to know, to feel and to realize the importance of the work in which they are engaged—to understand its principles and comprehend the way of life. They can bear testimony to a generation that has nearly grown from childhood since the death of the Prophet Joseph Smith.

The Lord said in relation to those who have driven the Saints that he would visit “judgment, wrath and indignation, wailing and anguish, and gnashing of teeth upon their heads unto the third and fourth generations, so long as they repent not and hate me, saith the Lord your God.”

I am a native of Potsdam, St. Lawrence County, New York—a town somewhat famous for its literary institutions, its learning and the religion and morality of its inhabitants. I left there in my youth, with my father's family, because we had received the gospel of Jesus

Christ, as revealed through Joseph Smith; and followed with the Saints through their drivings and trials unto the present day.

I have never seen the occasion, nor let the opportunity slip, from the time when I first came to a knowledge of the truth of the work of the Lord in the last days, that I understood it was in my power to do good for the advancement of this work, but what I have used my utmost endeavors to accomplish that good. I have never failed to bear a faithful testimony to the work of God, or to carry out, to all intents and purposes, the wishes and designs of the Prophet Joseph Smith. I was his kinsman; was familiar with him, though several years his junior; knew his views, his sentiments, his ways, his designs, and many of the thoughts of his heart, and I do *know* that the servants of God, the Twelve Apostles, upon whom he laid the authority to bear off the Kingdom of God, and fulfill the work which he had commenced, have done according to his designs, in every particular, up to the present time, and are continuing to do so. And I know, furthermore, that he rejoiced in the fact that the law of redemption and Celestial Marriage was revealed unto the Church in such a manner that it would be out of the power of earth and hell to destroy it; and that he rejoiced in the fact that the servants of God were ready prepared, having the keys, to bear off the work he had commenced. Previous to my leaving Potsdam, there was but one man that I heard of in that town who did not believe the Bible. He proclaimed himself an atheist and he drowned himself.

The Latter-day Saints believe the Bible. An agent of the American Bible Society called on me the other day and wanted to know if we would aid the Society in circulating the Bible in our Territory. I replied yes, by all means, for it was the book from which we were enabled to set forth our doctrines, and especially the doctrine of plural marriage.

There is an opinion in the breasts of many persons—who suppose that they believe the Bible—that Christ, when he came, did away with plural marriage, and that he inaugurated what is termed monogamy; and there are certain arguments and quotations used to maintain this view of the subject, one of which is found in Paul's first epistle to Timothy (iii chap. 2 vs.), where Paul says: "A Bishop should be blameless, the husband of one wife." The friends of monogamy render it in this way: "A Bishop should be blameless, the husband of *but one* wife." That would imply that any one but a bishop might have more. But they will say, "We mean—a bishop should be blameless, the husband of one wife only." Well, that would also admit of the construction that other people might have more than one. I understand it to mean that a bishop must be a married man.

A short time ago, the Minister from the King of Greece to the United States called on President Young. I inquired of him in relation to the religion of his country, and asked him if the clergy were allowed to marry. It is generally understood that the Roman Catholic clergy are not allowed to marry. How is it with the Greek clergy? "Well," said he, "all the clergy marry, except the Bishop." I replied, "You render the saying of Paul differently

from what we do. We interpret it to mean—‘A bishop should be blameless, the husband of one wife *at least*;’” “We construe it,” said he, “directly the opposite.”

Now this passage does not prove that a man should have but one wife. It only proves that a bishop should be a married man. The same remark is made of deacons, that they also should have wives. Another passage is brought up where the Saviour speaks of divorce. He tells us that it is very wrong to divorce, and that Moses permitted it because of the hardness of their (the children of Israel) hearts. A man should leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife, and they twain should be one flesh. That is the principal argument raised that a man should have but one wife.

In the New Testament, in various places, certain eminent men are referred to as patterns of faith, purity, righteousness and piety. For instance, if you read the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, the 11th chap., you find therein selected those persons “who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turning to flight the armies of the aliens;” and it is said that by faith Jacob blessed the two sons of Joseph, and that he conferred upon them a blessing to the “utmost bounds of the everlasting hills.” Who was Joseph? Why, Joseph was the son of Rachel. And who was Rachel? Rachel was the second wife of Jacob, a polygamist. Jacob had four wives; and after he had taken the second (Rachel), she, being barren, gave a third wife unto her husband, that she might bear children unto him for her; and instead of being displeased with her for giving her husband another wife, God heard her prayer, blessed her, worked a miracle in her favor, by opening her womb, and she bore a son, and called his name Joseph, rejoicing in God, whom she testified would give her another son. The question now arises—were not Rachel and Jacob one flesh? Yes. Leah and Jacob were also one flesh. Jacob is selected by the Apostle Paul as a pattern of faith for Christians to follow; he blessed his twelve sons, whom he had by four wives. The law of God, as it existed in those days, and as laid down in this book (the Bible), makes children born of adultery or of fornication bastards; and they were prohibited from entering into the congregation of the Lord unto the fourth generation.

Now, instead of God blessing Rachel and Jacob and their offspring, as we are told he did, we might have expected something entirely different, had it not been that God was pleased with and approved and sustained a plurality of wives.

While we are considering this subject, we will enquire, did the Saviour in any place that we read of, in the course of his mission on the earth, denounce a plurality of wives? He lived in a nation of Jews; the law of Moses was in force, plurality of wives was the custom, and thousands upon thousands of people, from the highest to the lowest in the land, were polygamists. The Savior denounced adultery; he denounced fornication; he denounced lust; also, divorce: but is there a single sentence asserting that plurality of wives is wrong?

If so, where is it? Who can find it? Why did he not say it was wrong? "Think not," said he, "that I am come to destroy the law or the Prophets. I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. Not one jot or one tittle shall pass from the law and the Prophets, but all shall be fulfilled." Of what does the Savior speak when he refers to "the law?" Why, of the Ten Commandments, and other rules of life commanded by God and adopted by the ancients, and which Bro. Pratt referred to yesterday, showing you from the sacred book that God legislated and made laws for the protection of a plurality of wives, (Exod. 21, 10) and that he *commanded* men to take a plurality under some circumstances. Brother Pratt further showed that the Lord made arrangements to protect, to all intents and purposes, the interests of the first wife; and to shield and protect the children of a wife from disinheritance who might be unfortunate enough not to have the affections of her husband. Deut. 21. 15.) These things were plainly written in the law—that law of which the Savior says "not one jot or one tittle shall pass away." Continuing our inquiry, we pass on to the epistles of John the Evangelist, which we find in the book of Revelations, written to the seven churches of Asia. In them we find the Evangelist denounces adultery, fornication, and all manner of iniquities and abominations of which these churches were guilty. Anything against a plurality of wives? No; not a syllable. Yet those churches were in a country in which plurality was the custom. Hundreds of Saints had more wives than one; and if it had been wrong, what would have been the result? Why, John would have denounced the practice, the same as the children of Israel were denounced for marrying heathen wives, had it not been that the law of plurality was a commandment of God.

Again, on this point, we can refer to the Prophets of the Old Testament—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others. When God called those men he warned them that if they did not deliver the message to the people which he gave them concerning their sins and iniquities his vengeance should rest upon their heads. These are his words to Ezekiel: "Son of man, I have made thee a watchman unto the house of Israel: therefore hear the word at my mouth, and give them warning from me. When I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; and thou givest him not warning, nor speakest to warn the wicked from his wicked way, to save his life; the same wicked *man* shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand. Yet if thou warn the wicked, and he turn not from his wickedness, nor from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity; but thou hast delivered thy soul." (Ezek. iii. 17, 18, 19.) How do we find these prophets of the Lord fulfilling the commandments of the Almighty? We find them pouring out denunciations upon the heads of the people—against adultery, fornication and every species of wickedness. All this, too, in a country in which, from the King down to the lowest orders of the people, a plurality of wives was practised. Do they say anything against plurality of wives? Not one word. It was only in cases where men and women took improper *license* with each other, in violation to the holy law of marriage, that they were guilty of sin.

If plurality of wives had been a violation of the seventh commandment those prophets would have denounced it, otherwise their silence on the matter would have been dangerous to themselves, inasmuch as the blood of the people would have been required at their hands. The opposers of Celestial Marriage sometimes quote a passage in the seventh chapter of Romans, second and third verses, to show that a plurality of wives is wrong; but when we come to read the passage it shows that a plurality of *husbands* is wrong. You can read the passage for yourselves. In the forcible parable used by the Savior in relation to the rich man and Lazarus, we find recorded that the poor man Lazarus was carried to Abraham's bosom—Abraham the father of the faithful. The rich man calls unto Father Abraham to send Lazarus, who is afar off. Who was Abraham? He was a man who had a plurality of wives. And yet all good Christians, even pious church deacons, expect when they die to go to Abraham's bosom. I am sorry to say, however, that thousands of them will be disappointed, from the fact that they cannot and will not go where any one has a plurality of wives; and I am convinced that Abraham will not turn out his own wives to receive such unbelievers in God's law. One peculiarity of this parable is the answer of Abraham to the application of the rich man, to send Lazarus to his five brothers "lest they come into this place of torment," which was—"they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them; and if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." Moses' law provided for a plurality of wives, and the prophets observed that law, and Isaiah predicts its observance even down to the latter-days. Isaiah, in his 4th chap, and 1st and 2nd verses, says "Seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach. In that day shall the branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent."

A reference to the Scriptures shows that the reproach of woman is to be childless, Gen. c. 30, v. 23; Luke c. 1, v. 25.

We will now refer to John the Baptist. He came as the forerunner of Christ. He was a lineal descendant of the house of Levi. His father was a priest. John the Baptist was a child born by miracle, God having revealed to his father that Elizabeth, who had been many years barren, should bear a son. John feared not the world, but went forth preaching in the wilderness of Judea, declaiming against wickedness and corruption in the boldest terms. He preached against extortion: against the cruelty exercised by the soldiers and tax gatherers. He even was so bold as to rebuke the king on his throne, to his face, for adultery. Did he say anything against a plurality of wives? No: it cannot be found. Yet thousands were believers in and practised this order of marriage, under the law of Moses that God had revealed.

In bringing this subject before you, we cannot help saying that God knew what was best for his people. Hence he commanded them as he would have them act. The law regulating marriage pre-

vicious to Moses, recognized a plurality of wives. Abraham and Jacob and others had a plurality. These are the men who are referred to in scripture as patterns of piety and purity. David had many wives. The scripture says that David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord and turned not aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, save in the matter of Uriah the Hittite, 1 Kings, 15 chap. 5 vs. "I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart which shall fulfill all my will. Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus." Acts 13 chap., 22 and 23 vs. Did David sin in taking so many wives? No. In what, then, did his sin consist? It was because he took the wife of Uriah, the Hittite—that is, violated the law of God in taking her. The Lord had given him the wives of Saul and would have given him many more; but he had no right to take one who belonged to another. When he did so the curse of adultery fell upon his head, and his wives were taken from him and given to another. We will now inquire in relation to the Savior himself. From whom did he descend? From the house of David, a polygamist; and if you will trace the names of the families through which he descended you will find that numbers of them had a plurality of wives. How appropriate it would have been for Jesus, descending as he did from a race of polygamists, to denounce this institution of plural marriage and show its sinfulness, had it been a sin! Can we suppose for one moment, if Patriarchal Marriage were wrong, that he would, under the circumstances have been silent concerning it or failed to denounce it in the most positive manner? Then if plural marriage be adultery and the offspring spurious, Christ Jesus is not the Christ; and we must look for another.

All good Christians are flattering themselves with the hope that they will finally enter the gates of the New Jerusalem. I presume this is the hope of all denominations—Catholics, Protestants, Greeks, and all who believe the Bible. Suppose they go there, what will they find? They will find at the twelve gates twelve angels, and "names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel." The names of the twelve sons of Jacob, the polygamist. Can a monogamist enter there? "And the walls, of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the lamb;" and at the gates the names of the twelve tribes of Israel—from the twelve sons of the four wives of Jacob. Those who denounce Patriarchal Marriage will have to stay without and never walk the golden streets. And any man or woman that lifts his or her voice to proclaim against a plurality of wives under the Government of God, will have to seek an inheritance outside of that city. For "there shall in no wise enter into it, anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie, for without are sorcerers, whoremongers, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." Is not the man that denounces Celestial Marriage a liar? Does he not work abomination? "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and offspring of [the polygamist] David, the bright and the morning star."

May God enable us to keep his law, for "blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life and may enter in through the gate into the city." Amen.

---

## DISCOURSE

ON

# CELESTIAL MARRIAGE,

DELIVERED BY

ELDER GEORGE Q. CANNON,

IN THE

NEW TABERNACLE, SALT LAKE CITY, OCTOBER 9TH, 1869.

I will repeat a few verses in the tenth chapter of Mark, commencing at the twenty-eighth verse :

Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.

And Jesus answered and said, verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father or mother, or wife or children, or lands, for my sake and the gospel's,

But he shall receive an hundred fold now in this time, houses and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life.

In rising to address you this morning, my brethren and sisters, I rely upon your faith and prayers and the blessing of God. We have heard, during Conference, a great many precious instructions, and in none have I been more interested than in those which have been given to the Saints concerning that much mooted doctrine called Patriarchal or Celestial Marriage. I am interested in this doctrine, because I see salvation, temporal and spiritual, embodied therein. I know, pretty well, what the popular feelings concerning this doctrine are; I am familiar with the opinions of the world, having traveled and mingled with the people sufficiently to be conversant with



their ideas in relation to this subject. I am also familiar with the feelings of the Latter-day Saints upon this point. I know the sacrifice of feeling which it has caused for them to adopt this principle in their faith and lives. It has required the revelation of God, our Heavenly Father, to enable his people to receive this principle and carry it out. I wish, here, to make one remark in connection with this subject—that while there is abundant proof to be found in the scriptures and elsewhere in support of this doctrine, still it is not because it was practised four thousand years ago by the servants and people of God, or because it has been practised by any people or nation in any period of the world's history, that the Latter-day Saints have adopted it and made it part of their practice, but it is because God, our Heavenly Father, has revealed it unto us. If there were no record of its practice to be found, and if the Bible, Book of Mormon and Book of Doctrine and Covenants were totally silent in respect to this doctrine, it would nevertheless be binding upon us as a people, God himself having given a revelation for us to practise it at the present time. This should be understood by us as a people. It is gratifying to know, however, that we are not the first of God's people unto whom this principle has been revealed; it is gratifying to know that we are only following in the footsteps of those who have preceded us in the work of God, and that we, to-day, are only carrying out the principle which God's people observed, in obedience to revelation received from him, thousands of years ago. It is gratifying to know that we are suffering persecution, that we are threatened with fines and imprisonment for the practice of precisely the same principle which Abraham, the "friend of God," practised in his life and taught to his children after him.

The discourses of Brother Orson Pratt and of President George A. Smith have left but very little to be said in relation to the scriptural arguments in favor of this doctrine. I know that the general opinion among men is that the Old Testament, to some extent, sustains it; but that the New Testament—Jesus and the Apostles, were silent concerning it. It was clearly proved in our hearing yesterday, and the afternoon of the day previous, that the New Testament, though not so explicit in reference to the doctrine, is still decidedly in favor of it and sustains it. Jesus very plainly told the Jews, when boasting of being the seed of Abraham, that if they were, they would do the works of Abraham. He and the Apostles, in various places, clearly set forth that Abraham was the great exemplar of faith for them to follow, and that they must follow him if they ever expected to participate in the glory and exaltation enjoyed by Abraham and his faithful seed. Throughout the New Testament Abraham is held up to the converts to the doctrines which Jesus taught, as an example worthy of imitation, and in no place is there a word of condemnation uttered concerning him. The Apostle Paul, in speaking of him says:

"Know ye, therefore, that they which are of the faith, the same are the children of Abraham. \* \* \* So then they which be of the faith are blessed with faithful Abraham."

He also says that the Gentiles, through adoption, became Abra-

ham's seed ; that the blessing of Abraham, says he, might come upon the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, showing plainly that Jesus and all the Apostles who alluded to the subject, held the deeds of Abraham to be, in every respect, worthy of imitation.

Who was this Abraham ? I have heard the saying frequently advanced, that in early life, being an idolater, it was an idolatrous, heathenish principle which he adopted in taking to himself a second wife while Sarah still lived. Those who make this assertion in reference to the great Patriarch, seem to be ignorant of the fact that he was well advanced in life and had served God faithfully many years, prior to making any addition to his family. He did not have a plurality of wives until years after the Lord had revealed himself to him, commanding him to leave Ur, of the Chaldees, and go forth to a land which he would give to him and his posterity for an everlasting possession. He went forth and lived in that land many long years before the promise of God was fulfilled unto him—namely, that in his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed ; and Abraham was still without any heir, except Eliezer, of Damascus, the steward of his house. At length, after living thus for ten years, God commanded him to take to himself another wife, who was given to him by his wife Sarah. When the offspring of this marriage was born, Abraham was eighty-six years old.

We read of no word of condemnation from the Lord for this act—something which we might naturally expect if, as this unbelieving and licentious generation affirm, the act of taking more wives than one be such a vile crime, and so abominable in the sight of God, for if it be evil in the sight of the Lord to-day, it was then, for the scriptures inform us that he changes not, he is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, and is without variableness or the shadow of turning. But instead of condemnation, God revealed himself continually to his friend Abraham, teaching his will unto him, revealing all things concerning the future which it was necessary for him to understand, and promising him that, though he had been blessed with a son, Ishmael, yet in Isaac, a child of promise, not yet born, should his seed be called. Abraham was to have yet another son. Sarah, in her old age, because of her faithfulness, because of her willingness to comply with the requirements and revelations of God, was to have a son given unto her. Such an event was so unheard of among women at her time of life that, though the Lord promised it, she could not help laughing at the idea. But God fulfilled his promise, and in due time Isaac was born, and was greatly blessed of the Lord.

Determined to try his faithful servant Abraham to the uttermost, the Lord, some years after the birth of his son, in whom he had promised that Abraham's seed should be called, required him to offer up this boy as a burnt offering to him ; and Abraham, nothing doubting, but full of faith and integrity, and of devotion to his God, proved himself worthy of the honored title that had been conferred upon him, namely, "the friend of God," by taking his son Isaac, in whom most of his hopes for the future centred, up to the mountain, and there, having built the altar, he bound the victim and, with

knife uplifted, was about to strike the fatal blow, when the angel of the Lord cried out of heaven, commanding him not to slay his son. The Lord was satisfied, having tried him to the uttermost, and found him willing even to shed the blood of his well beloved son.

The Lord was so pleased with the faithfulness of Abraham, that he gave unto him the greatest promise he could give to any human being on the face of the earth. What do you think was the nature of that promise? Did he promise to Abraham a crown of eternal glory? Did he promise to him that he should be in the presence of the Lamb, that he should tune his harp, and sing praises to God and the Lamb, throughout the endless ages of eternity? Let me quote it to you, and it would be well if all the inhabitants of the earth would reflect upon it. Said the Lord:

"In blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies."

This was the promise which God gave to Abraham, in that hour of his triumph, in that hour when there was joy in heaven over the faithfulness of one of God's noblest and most devoted sons. Think of the greatness of this blessing! Can you count the stars of heaven, or even the grains of a handful of sand? No, it is beyond the power of earth's most gifted sons to do either, and yet God promised to Abraham that his seed should be as innumerable as the stars of heaven or as the sand on the sea shore.

How similar was this promise of God to Abraham to that made by Jesus as a reward for faithfulness to those who followed him? Said Jesus; "He that forsakes brothers or sisters, houses or lands, father or mother, wives or children, shall receive a hundred fold in this life with persecution, and eternal life in the world to come." A very similar blessing to that which God, long before, had made to Abraham, and couched in very similar terms.

It is pertinent for us to enquire, on the present occasion, how the promises made by Jesus and his Father, in ages of the world separated by a long interval the one from the other, could be realized under the system which prevails throughout Christendom at the present day? In the monogamic system, under which the possession of more than one living wife is regarded as such a crime, and as being so fearfully immoral, how could the promise of the Savior to his faithful followers, that they should have a hundredfold of wives and children, in this present life, ever be realized? There is a way which God has provided in a revelation given to this Church, in which he says:

"Straight is the gate, and narrow the way that leadeth unto the exaltation and continuation of the lives, and few there be that find it, because ye receive me not in this world, neither do ye know me."

God revealed that straight and narrow way to Abraham, and taught him how he could enter therein. He taught him the princi-

ple of a plurality of wives ; Abraham practised it and bequeathed it to his children as a principle which they were to practise. Under such a system it was a comparatively easy matter for men to have a hundredfold of wives, children, fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters and everything else in proportion ; and in no other way could the promises of Jesus be realized by his followers, than in the way God has provided, and which he has revealed to his Church and people in these latter-days.

I have felt led to dwell on these few passages from the sayings of Jesus, to show you that there is abundance of scriptural proofs in favor of this principle and the position this Church has assumed, in addition to those previously referred to.

It is a blessed thing to know that, in this as in every other doctrine and principle taught by us as a Church, we are sustained by the revelations God gave to his people anciently. One of the strongest supports the Elders of this Church have had in their labors among the nations was the knowledge that the Bible and New Testament sustained every principle they advanced to the people. When they preached faith, repentance, baptism for the remission of sins, the laying on of hands for the reception of the Holy Ghost, the gathering of the people from the nations, the re-building of Jerusalem, the second coming of Christ, and every other principle ever touched upon by them, it was gratifying to know that they were sustained by the scriptures, and that they could turn to chapter and verse among the sayings of Jesus and his Apostles, or among those of the ancient prophets, in confirmation of every doctrine they ever attempted to bring to the attention of those to whom they ministered. There is nothing with which the Latter-day Saints can, with more confidence, refer to the scriptures for confirmation and support, than the doctrine of plural marriage, which at the present time, among one of the most wicked, adulterous and corrupt generations the world has ever seen, is so much hated, and for which mankind generally, are so anxious to cast out and persecute the Latter-day Saints.

If we look abroad and peruse the records of everyday life throughout the whole of Christendom, we find that crimes of every hue, and of the most appalling and revolting character are constantly committed, exciting neither surprise nor comment. Murder, robbery, adultery, seduction and every species of villany known in the voluminous catalogue of crime, in modern times, are regarded as mere matters of ordinary occurrence, and yet there is a hue and cry raised, almost as wide as Christendom, for the persecution, by fine, imprisonment, proscription, outlawry or extermination, of the people of Utah because, knowing that God, the Eternal Father, has spoken in these days and revealed his mind and will to them, they dare to carry out his behests. For years they have meekly submitted to this persecution and contumely, but they appeal now, as ever, to all rational, reflecting men, and invite comparison between the state of society here and in any portion of this or any other country, knowing that the verdict will be unanimous and overwhelming in their favor. In every civilized country on the face of the earth the

seducer plies his arts to envelop his victim within his meshes, in order to accomplish her ruin most completely; and it is well known that men holding positions of trust and responsibility, looked upon as honorable and highly respectable members of society, violate their marriage vows by carrying on their secret amours and supporting mistresses; yet against the people of Utah where such things are totally unknown, there is a continual and senseless outcry because they practise the heaven-revealed system of a plurality of wives. It is a most astonishing thing, and no greater evidence could be given that Satan reigns in the hearts of the children of men, and that he is determined, if possible, to destroy the work of God from the face of the earth.

The Bible, the only work accepted by the nations of Christendom, as a divine revelation, sustains this doctrine, from beginning to end. The only revelation on record that can be quoted against it came through the Prophet Joseph Smith, and is contained in the Book of Mormon; and strange to say, here in Salt Lake City, a day or two since, one of the leading men of the nation, in his eager desire and determination to cast discredit on this doctrine, unable to do so by reference to the Bible, which he no doubt, in common with all Christians, acknowledges as divine, was compelled to have recourse to the Book of Mormon, a work which on any other point he would most unquestionably have scouted and ridiculed, as an emanation from the brain of an imposter. What consistency! A strange revolution this, that men should have recourse to our own works, whose authenticity they most emphatically deny, to prove us in the wrong. Yet this attempt, whenever made, cannot be sustained, for Brother Pratt clearly showed to you, in his remarks the other day, that instead of the Book of Mormon being opposed to this principle, it contains an express provision for the revelation of the principle to us as a people at some future time—namely, that when the Lord should desire to raise up unto himself a righteous seed, he would command his people to that effect; plainly setting forth that a time would come when he would command his people to do so.

It is necessary that this principle should be practised under the auspices and control of the priesthood. God has placed that priesthood in the Church to govern and control all the affairs thereof, and this is a principle which, if not practised in the greatest holiness and purity, might lead men into great sin, therefore the priesthood is the more necessary to guide and control men in the practice of this principle. There might be circumstances and situations in which it would not be wisdom in the mind of God for his people to practise this principle, but so long as a people are guided by the priesthood and revelations of God there is no danger of evil arising therefrom. If we, as a people, had attempted to practise this principle without revelation, it is likely that we should have been led into grievous sins and the condemnation of God would have rested upon us; but the Church waited until the proper time came, and then the people practised it according to the mind and will of God, making a sacrifice of their own feelings in so doing. But the history

of the world goes to prove that the practice of this principle even by nations ignorant of the gospel, has resulted in greater good to them than the practice of monogamy or the one-wife system in the so-called Christian nations. To-day Christendom holds itself and its institutions aloft as a pattern for all men to follow. If you travel throughout the United States and through the nations of Europe in which Christianity prevails, and talk with the people about their institutions, they will boast of them as being the most permanent, indestructible and progressive of any institutions existing upon the earth; yet it is a fact well known to historians, that the Christian nations of Europe are the youngest nations on the globe. Where are the nations which have existed from time immemorial? They are not to be found in Christian monogamic Europe, but in Asia, among the polygamic races—China, Japan, Hindostan and the various races of that vast continent. Those nations, from the most remote times, practised plural marriage handed down to them by their forefathers. Although they are looked upon by the nations of Europe as semi-civilized, you will not find among them women prostituted, debased and degraded as she is through Christendom. She may be treated coldly, and degraded, but among them, except where the Christian element to a large extent prevails, she is not debased and polluted as she is among the so-called Christian nations. It is a fact worthy of note that the shortest lived nations of which we have record have been monogamic. Rome, with her arts, sciences, and war-like instincts, was once the mistress of the world; but her glory faded. She was a monogamic nation, and the numerous evils attending that system early laid the foundation for that ruin which eventually overtook her. The strongest sayings of Jesus, recorded in the New Testament, were leveled against the dreadful corruptions practised in Rome and wherever the Romans held sway. The leaven of their institutions had worked its way into the Jewish nation, Jewry or Palestine being then a Roman province, and governed by Roman officers, who brought with them their wicked institutions, and Jesus denounced the practices which prevailed there.

A few years before the birth of the Savior, Julius Cæsar was First Consul at Rome; he aimed at and obtained imperial power. He had four wives during his life and committed numerous adulteries. His first wife he married early; but becoming ambitious, the alliance did not suit him, and, as the Roman law did not permit him to retain her and marry another, he put her away. He then married the daughter of a consul, thinking to advance his interests thereby. She died, and a third was married. The third was divorced, and he married a fourth, with whom he was living at the time he was murdered. His grand-nephew, the Emperor Augustus Cæsar, reigned at the time of the birth of Christ. He is alluded to in history as one of the greatest of the Cæsars; he also had four wives. He divorced one after another, except the last, who out-lived him. These men were not singular in this practice; it was common in Rome; the Romans did not believe in plurality of wives, but in divorcing them; in taking wives for convenience and putting them away when they got tired of them. In our country divorces are in-

creasing, yet Roman-like, men expect purity and chastity from their wives they do not practise themselves. You recollect, doubtless, the famous answer of Cæsar when his wife was accused of an intrigue with an infamous man. Some one asked Cæsar why he had put away his wife. Said he, "The wife of Cæsar must not only be incorrupt but unsuspected." He could not bear to have the virtue of his wife even suspected, yet his own life was infamous in the extreme. He was a seducer, adulterer, and is reported to have practised even a worse crime, yet he expected his wife to possess a virtue which, in his highest and holiest moments, was utterly beyond his conception in his own life.

This leaven was spreading itself over every country where the Roman Empire had jurisdiction. It had reached Palestine in the days of the Savior, hence by understanding the practices prevalent in those times amongst that people, you will be better able to appreciate the strong language used by Jesus against putting away, or divorcing wives. Rome continued to practise corruption until she fell beneath the weight of it, and was overwhelmed, not by another monogamic race, but by the vigorous polygamic hordes from the north, who swept away Roman imperialism, establishing in the place thereof institutions of their own. But they speedily fell into the same habit of having one wife and multitudes of courtesans, and soon, like Rome, fell beneath their own corruptions.

When courtesans were taught every accomplishment and honored with the society of the leading men of the nation, and wives were deprived of these privileges, is it any wonder that Rome should fall? or that the more pure, or barbarious nations, as they were called, overwhelmed and destroyed her?

I have had it quoted to me many times that no great nations ever practised plural marriage. They who make such an assertion are utterly ignorant of history. What nations have left the deepest impress on the history of our race? Those which have practised plurality of marriage. They have prevented the dreadful crime of prostitution by allowing men to have more wives than one. I know we are dazzled by the glory of Christendom; we are dazzled with the glory of our own age. Like every generation that has preceded it, the present generation thinks it is the wisest and best, and nearer to God than any which has preceded it. This is natural; it is a weakness of human nature. This is the case with nations as well as generations. China, to-day, calls all western nations "outside barbarians." Japan, Hindostan and all other polygamic nations do the same, and in very many respects they have as much right to say that of monogamic nations, as the latter have to say it of them.

I heard a traveler remark a few days ago, while in conversation with him, "I have traveled through Asia Minor and Turkey and I have blushed many times when contrasting the practices and institutions of those people with those of my own country," the United States. He is a gentleman with whom I had a discussion some years ago on the principle of plural marriage. He has traveled a good deal since then, and he remarked to me: "Travel enlarges a man's head and his heart. I have learned a great many

things since we had a discussion together, and I have modified my views and opinions very materially with regard to the excellence of the institutions, habits and morals which prevail in Christendom." This gentleman told me that among those nations, which we call semi-civilized, there are no drinking saloons, no brothels, nor drunkenness, and an entire absence of many other evils which exist in our own nation. I think this testimony, coming from a man who, previously, had such strong prejudices, is very valuable. He is not the only one who has borne this testimony, but all reliable travelers who have lived in Oriental nations, vouch for the absence of those monstrous evils which flourish in and fatten and fester upon the vitals of all civilized or Christian nations.

In speaking of Utah and this peculiar practice amongst its people it is frequently said, "Look at the Turks and other Oriental nations and see how women are degraded and debased among them, and deprived of many privileges which they enjoy among us!" But if it be true that woman does not occupy her true position among those nations, is this not more attributable to their rejection of the gospel than to their practice of having a plurality of wives? Whatever her condition may be there, however, I do not therefore accept, as a necessary conclusion, that she must be degraded among us. We have received the gospel of the Lord Jesus, the principles of which elevate all who honor them, and will impart to our sisters every blessing necessary to make them noble and good in the presence of God and man.

Look at the efforts which are being made to elevate the sex among the Latter-day Saints! See the privileges that are given them, and listen to the teachings imparted to them day by day, week by week, and year by year, to encourage them to press forward in the march of improvement! The elevation of the sex must follow as a result of these instructions. The practice in the world is to select a few of the sex and to elevate them. There is no country in the world, probably, where women are idolized to the extent they are in the United States. But is the entire sex in the United States thus honored and respected? No; it is not. Any person who will travel, and observe while he is traveling, will find that thousands of women are degraded and treated as something very vile, and are terribly debased in consequence of the practices of men towards them. But the gospel of Jesus, and the revelations which God has given unto us concerning Patriarchal Marriage have a tendency to elevate the entire sex, and give all the privilege of being honored matrons and respected wives. There are no refuse among us—no class to be cast out, scorned and condemned; but every woman who chooses can be an honored wife and move in society in the enjoyment of every right which woman should enjoy to make her the equal of man as far as she can be his equal.

This is the result of the revelations of the gospel unto us, and the effect of the preaching and practice of this principle in our midst. I know, however, that there are those who shrink from this, who feel their hearts rebel against the principle, because of the equality it bestows on the sex. They would like to be the



honored few—the aristocrats of society as it were, while their sisters might perish on every hand around them. They would not, if they could, extend their hands to save their sisters from a life of degradation. This is wrong and a thing which God is displeased at. He has revealed this principle and commanded his servants to take wives. What for? That they may obey his great command—a command by which eternity is peopled, a command by which Abraham's seed shall become as the stars of heaven for multitude, and as the sand on the sea shore that cannot be counted. He has given to us this command, and shall we, the sterner sex, submit to all the difficulties and trials entailed in carrying it out? Shall we submit to all the afflictions and labor incident to this life to save our sisters, while many of you who are of the same sex, whose hearts ought to beat for their salvation as strongly as ours do, will not help us? I leave you all to answer. There is day of reckoning coming when you will be held accountable as well as we. Every woman in this church should join heart and hand in this great work, which has for its result, the redemption of the sexes, both male and female. No woman should slacken her hand or withhold her influence, but every one should seek by prayer and faith unto God for the strength and grace necessary to enable her to do so. "But," says one, "is not this a trial, and does it not inflict upon us unnecessary trials?" There are afflictions and trials connected with this principle. It is necessary there should be. Is there any law that God reveals unattended with a trial of some kind? Think of the time, you who are adults, and were born in the nations, when you joined the Church! Think of the trials connected with your espousal of the gospel. Did it not try you to go forth and be baptized? Did it not try you, when called upon to gather, to leave your homes and nearest and dearest friends, as many of you have done? Did it not try you to do a great many things you have been required to do in the gospel? Every law of the gospel has a trial connected with it, and the higher the law the greater the trial; and as we ascend nearer and nearer to the Lord our God we shall have greater trials to contend with in purifying ourselves before him. He has helped us this far. He has helped us to conquer our selfish feelings, and when our sisters seek unto him he helps them to overcome their feelings; he gives them strength to overcome their selfishness and jealousy. There is not a woman under the sound of my voice to-day, but can bear witness of this if she has tried it. You, sisters, whose husbands have taken other wives, can you not bear testimony that the principle has purified your hearts, made you less selfish, brought you nearer to God and given you power you never had before? There are hundreds within the sound of my voice to-day, both men and women, who can testify that this has been the effect that the practice of this principle has had upon them.

I am speaking now of what are called the spiritual benefits arising from the righteous practice of this principle. I am sure that through the practice of this principle, we shall have a purer community, a community more experienced, less selfish and with a higher knowledge of human nature than any other on the face of

the earth. It has already had this effect to a great extent, and its effects in these directions will increase as the practice of the principle becomes more general.

A lady visitor remarked to me not long ago, in speaking upon this subject: "Were I a man, I should feel differently probably to what I do; to your sex the institution cannot be so objectionable." This may be the case to some extent, but the practice of this principle is by no means without its trials for the males. The difficulties and perplexities connected with the care of a numerous family, to a man who has any ambition, are so great that nothing short of the revelations of God or the command of Jesus Christ, would tempt men to enter this order; the mere increase of facilities to gratify the lower passions of our natures would be no inducement to assume such an increase of grave responsibilities. These desires have been implanted in both male and female for a wise purpose, but their immoderate and illegal gratification is a source of evil equal to that system of repression prevalent in the world, to which thousands must submit or criminate themselves.

Just think, in the single State of Massachusetts, at the last census, there were 63,011 females more than males. Brother Pratt, in his remarks on this subject, truly remarked that the law of Massachusetts makes these 63,011 females either old maids or prostitutes, for that law says they shall not marry a man who has a wife. Think of this! And the same is true to a greater or less degree throughout all the older States, for the females preponderate in every one.

Thus far I have referred only to the necessity and benefit of this principle being practised in a moral point of view. I have said nothing about the physiological side of the question. This is one of if not the strongest sources of argument in its favor; but I do not propose to enter into that branch of the subject to any great extent on the present occasion. We are all, both men and women, physiologists enough to know that the procreative powers of man endure much longer than those of women. Granting, as some assert, that an equal number of the sexes exist, what would this lead to? Man must practice that which is vile and low or submit to a system of repression; because if he be married to a woman who is physically incapable, he must either do himself violence or what is far worse, he must have recourse to the dreadful and damning practice of having illegal connection with women, or become altogether like the beasts. Do you not see that if these things were introduced among our society they would be pregnant with the worst results? The greatest conceivable evils would result therefrom! How dreadful are the consequences of this system of which I am now speaking, as witnessed at the present time throughout all the nations of Christendom! You may see them on every hand. Yet the attempt is being continually made to bring us to the same standard, and to compel us to share the same evils.

When the principle of plurality of wives was revealed I was but a boy. When reflecting on the subject of the sealing power which was then being taught, the case of Jacob, who had four

wives, occurred to me, and I immediately concluded that the time would come when light connected with this practice would be revealed to us as a people. I was therefore prepared for the principle when it was revealed, and I know it is true on the principle that I know that baptism, the laying on of hands, the gathering, and everything connected with the gospel is true. If there were no books in existence, if the revelation itself were blotted out, and there was nothing written in its favor, extant among men, still I could bear testimony for myself that I know this is a principle which, if practised in purity and virtue, as it should be, will result in the exaltation and benefit of the human family; and that it will exalt woman until she is redeemed from the effects of the Fall, and from that curse pronounced upon her in the beginning. I believe the correct practice of this principle will redeem women from the effects of that curse—namely, “Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.” All the evils connected with jealousy have their origin in this. It is natural for woman to cleave to man; it was pronounced upon her in the beginning, seemingly as a punishment. I believe the time will come when, by the practice of the virtuous principles which God has revealed, woman will be emancipated from that punishment and that feeling. Will she cease to love man? No, it is not necessary for her to cease to love.

How is it among the nations of the earth? Why, woman, in their yearning after the other sex and in their desire for maternity, will do anything to gratify that instinct of their nature, and yield to anything and be dishonored even rather than not gratify it; and in consequence of that which has been pronounced upon them, they are not held accountable to the same extent that men are. Man is strong, he is the head of woman, and God will hold him responsible for the use of the influence he exercises over the opposite sex. Hence we are told by Brother Pratt that there are degrees of glory, and that the faithful man may receive the power of God—the greatest he has ever bestowed upon man—namely the power of procreation. It is a god-like power, but how it is abused! How men debase themselves and the other sex by its unlawful and improper exercise! We were told there is a glory to which alone that power will be accorded in the life to come. Still there will be millions of women saved in the kingdom of God, while men, through the abuse of this precious gift, will not be counted worthy of such a privilege. And this very punishment will, in the end, be woman’s salvation, because she is not held accountable to the same degree that men are.

This is a subject that we should all do well to reflect upon. There are many points connected with the question physiologically, that might be dwelt upon with great advantage. I have heard it said, and seen it printed, that the children born here under this system are not so smart as others; that their eyes lack lustre and that they are dull in intellect; and many strangers, especially ladies, when arriving here, are anxious to see the children, having read accounts which have led them to expect that most of the children born here are deficient. But the testimony of Professor Park,

the principal of the University of Deseret, and of other leading teachers of the young here, is that they never saw children with a greater aptitude for the acquisition of knowledge than the children raised in this Territory. There are no brighter children to be found in the world than those born in this Territory. Under the system of Patriarchal Marriage, the offspring, besides being equally as bright and brighter intellectually, are much more healthy and strong. Need I go into particulars to prove this? To you who are married there is no necessity of doing so; you know what I mean. You all know that many women are sent to the grave prematurely through the evil they have to endure from their husbands during pregnancy and lactation, and their children often sustain irremediable injury.

Another good effect of the institution here is that you may travel throughout our entire Territory, and virtue prevails. Our young live virtuously until they marry. But how is it under the monogamic system? Temptations are numerous on every hand and young men fall a prey to vice. An eminent medical professor in New York recently declared, while delivering a lecture to his class in one of the colleges there, that if he wanted a man twenty-five years of age, free from a certain disease, he would not know where to find him. What a terrible statement to make! In this community no such thing exists. Our boys grow up in purity, honoring and respecting virtue; our girls do the same, and the great mass of them are pure. There may be impurities. We are human, and it would not be consistent with our knowledge of human nature to say that we are entirely pure, but we are the most pure of any people within the confines of the Republic. We have fewer unvirtuous boys and girls in our midst than any other community within the range of my knowledge. Both sexes grow up in vigor, health and purity.

These, my brethren and sisters, are some of the results which I wanted to allude to in connection with this subject. Much more might be said. There is not a man or woman who has listened to me to-day, but he and she have thoughts, reasons and arguments to sustain this principle passing through their minds which I have not touched upon, or, if touched upon at all, in a very hasty manner.

The question arises, What is going to be done with this institution? Will it be overcome? The conclusion arrived at long ago is that it is God and the people for it. God has revealed it, he must sustain it, we can not; we can not bear it off, he must. I know that Napoleon said Providence was on the side of the heaviest artillery, and many men think that God is on the side of the strongest party. The Midianites probably thought so when Gideon fell upon them with three hundred men. Sennacherib and the Assyrians thought so when they came down in their might to blot out Israel. But God is mighty; God will prevail; God will sustain that which he has revealed, and he will uphold and strengthen his servants and bear off his people. We need not be afflicted by a doubt; a shadow of doubt need not cross our minds as to the result. We know that