

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 woman 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 a 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 citizen 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 18 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, *argum ntum 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 kinsman.'" I accept his 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 favors 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 18th 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, whether I bring you, shall ye not do; neither shall ye walk in their ordinances."

Both the Egyptians and the Canaanites practiced 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 practiced. 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 that

"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 that 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 and 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 come 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 21st, 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, born 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 he shall give the birthright of the first-born to the son of the hated, who 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."

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 no where condemned in the law of God, we are entitled to construe this law as applying to polygamists. But I have shown already that Lev. 18, 18, is a positive prohibition of this law, and therefore this passage must be interpreted by that which I have quoted. I propose to erect 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 this supposition that 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 can not 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 firstborn 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 sheepstealing, and we can all go after the flocks this afternoon.

The second passage is Exodus 21st, 7th to 11th verses, referring to the laws of breach of promise. Mr. Pratt says this 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 menservants 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 had 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 will break the vow of engagement, then He 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 can not 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 25 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 my husband 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 so, 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 feet, 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 gentleman 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 Maablon 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 31st, 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 a 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 21st, 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 be 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 woman 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 22d chap., 16 and 17, and Deuteronomy 22, and 28 and 29.

"And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and he 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 for 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 was 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 18, 18.

I tell you, my friends, these are simple downright assumptions. The position is first taken, and therefore these passages are 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, 24th and 3rd, etc. 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 in 1608. 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