

SMITH GEORGE ALBERT,  
NEWMAN JOHN PHILIP, CANNON  
GEORGE QUAYLE И ДР.

# THE BIBLE AND POLYGAMY

**George Cannon**  
**George Smith**  
**Orson Pratt**  
**John Newman**  
**The Bible and Polygamy**

*[http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio\\_book/?art=24181228](http://www.litres.ru/pages/biblio_book/?art=24181228)  
The Bible and Polygamy / Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?:*

# Содержание

CORRESPONDENCE	5
FIRST DAY	21
ARGUMENT OF PROFESSOR ORSON PRATT	22
ARGUMENT	40
Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.	58



**Orson Pratt, J. P.  
Newman, George A.  
Smith, George Q. Cannon  
The Bible and Polygamy / Does  
the Bible Sanction Polygamy?**

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**BETWEEN**

**REVEREND DR. J. P. NEWMAN,**

**Pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist  
Church, Washington, D. C.,**

**AND**

TO PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir: — In acceptance of the challenge given in your journal, "The Salt Lake Daily Telegraph," of the 3rd of May last, to discuss the question, "Does the Bible sanction polygamy?" I have hereby to inform you that I am now ready to hold a public debate with you as the head of the Mormon Church upon the above question, under such regulations as may be agreed upon for said discussion; and I suggest for our mutual convenience that, either by yourself or by two gentlemen whom you shall designate, you may meet two gentlemen whom I will select for the purpose of making all necessary arrangements for the debate, with as little delay as possible. May I hope for a reply at your earliest convenience, and at least not later than 3 o'clock to-day?

*Respectfully, etc.,*

J. P. NEWMAN.

—

*Salt Lake City, U. T., Aug. 6th, 1870.*

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir: — Yours of even date has just been received, in answer to which I have to inform you that no challenge was ever given by me to any person through the columns of the "Salt Lake Daily Telegraph," and this is the first information I have received that any such challenge ever appeared.

You have been mis-informed with regard to the "Salt Lake Daily Telegraph;" it was not my journal, but was owned and edited by Dr. Fuller, of Chicago, who was not a member of our church, and I was not acquainted with its columns.

*Respectfully,*  
*BRIGHAM YOUNG.*

---

*Salt Lake City, Aug. 6, 1870.*

TO PRESIDENT BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—I confess my disappointment at the contents of your note in reply to mine of this date. In the far East it is impossible to distinguish the local relations between yourself and those papers which advocate the interests of your Church; and when the copy of the "Telegraph" containing the article of the 3rd of May last, reached Washington, the only construction put upon it by my friends was that it was a challenge to me to come to your city and discuss the Bible doctrine of polygamy.

Had I chosen to put a different construction on that article, and to take no further notice of it, you could then have adopted the "Telegraph" as your organ and the said article as a challenge, which I either could not or dared not accept. That I am justified in this construction is clear from the following facts:

1. The article in the "Telegraph," of May 3rd, contains these

expressions, alluding to my sermon as reported in the N. Y. "Herald," it says: "The discourse was a lengthened argument to prove that the Bible does not sustain polygamy. \* \* \* \* \*

The sermon should have been delivered in the New Tabernacle in this city, with ten thousand Mormons to listen to it, and then Elder Orson Pratt, or some prominent Mormon, should have had a hearing on the other side and the people been allowed to decide. \* \* \* \* \*

Dr. Newman, by his very sermon, recognizes the religious element of the question. \* \* \* \* \*

Let us have a fair contest of peaceful argument and let the best side win. \* \* \*

We will publish their notices in the "Telegraph," report their discourses as far as possible, use every influence in our power, if any is needed, to secure them the biggest halls and crowded congregations, and we are satisfied that every opportunity will be given them to conduct a campaign. We base this last remark on a statement made last Sunday week in the Tabernacle by President Geo. A. Smith, that the public halls throughout the Territory have been and would be open to clergymen of other denominations coming to Utah to preach. \* \* \*

Come on and convert them by the peaceful influences of the Bible instead of using the means now proposed. Convince them by reason and Scriptural argument and no Cullom Bill will be required."

2. I understand the article containing the above expressions, was written by Elder Sloan, of the Mormon Church, and at that time associate editor of the "Telegraph;" and that he was, and has since been, in constant intercourse with yourself.



The expressions of the said article, as above cited, were the foundation of the impression throughout the country, that a challenge had thus been given through the columns of the "Telegraph," and as such, I myself, had no alternative but so to regard and accept it. I may add that I am informed that an impression prevailed here in Utah, that a challenge had been given and accepted. Under this impression I have acted from that day to this, having myself both spoken of and seen allusions to the anticipated discussion in several prominent papers of the country.

3. It was not till after my arrival in your city last evening, in pursuance of this impression, that I learned the fact that the same Elder Sloan, in the issue of the "Salt Lake Herald," of Aug. 3rd, attempts for the first time to disabuse the public of the idea so generally prevalent. Still acting in good faith and knowing that you had never denied or recalled the challenge of the 3rd of May, I informed you of my presence in your city and of the object of my visit here.

My note this morning with your reply, will serve to put the matter before the public in its true light and dispel the impression of very many in all parts of the country, that such a challenge had been given and that such a discussion would be held.

Feeling that I have now fully discharged my share of the responsibility in the case, it only remains for me to subscribe myself, as before,

*Respectfully,*  
*J. P. NEWMAN.*

---

*Salt Lake City, Aug. 6, 1870.*

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir: – It will be a pleasure to us, if you will address our congregation to-morrow morning, the 7th inst., in the small Tabernacle at 10 a. m., or, should you prefer it, in the New Tabernacle at 2 p. m., same inst., or both morning and evening.

*Respectfully,*  
*BRIGHAM YOUNG.*

P. S. I hope to hear from you immediately.

*B. Y.*

---

*Salt Lake City, Aug. 6, 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 conclude that this distortion of the truth in accusing me of disclaiming and declining a challenge, which I never even contemplated, is unfair and ungentlemanly in the extreme and must have been invented with some sinister motive? 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 congregation, 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 can 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 inclosed 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, etc.,*

*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 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.*

# 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 and originated as it were with Israel or Jacob, in 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 Scripture 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, 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 would be established on a permanent footing, equal in legality to that of monogamy. 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 monogamists 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 children, 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 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 was 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, 22nd 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, 22nd 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-lame, and prostitutes of various forms; 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."

The next passage to which I will refer you is in 2nd Chronicles, 24th chapter, 2nd, 3rd, 15th and 18th 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, 28th verse, if I recollect aright: (looking). No, 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 towards 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 the 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 —

(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 that 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 any thing have 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 excepted, 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 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 it 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 innocence. 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, was 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 which 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 undefined 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 doorway 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 forever."

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 to 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 passage 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 in 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.

# Конец ознакомительного фрагмента.

Текст предоставлен ООО «ЛитРес».

Прочитайте эту книгу целиком, [купив полную легальную версию](#) на ЛитРес.

Безопасно оплатить книгу можно банковской картой Visa, MasterCard, Maestro, со счета мобильного телефона, с платежного терминала, в салоне МТС или Связной, через PayPal, WebMoney, Яндекс.Деньги, QIWI Кошелек, бонусными картами или другим удобным Вам способом.