

the Philistines, in manhood's prime; in the din of battle; but in his bed after he had disposed of his worldly goods by will, leaving no portion of the money held by him as a ruler in Israel to the congregation of the Lord. Did Mr. Taylor inherit to his master's house? Did he receive the wives of Pres. Young to be his wives? To whom were the wives of Pres. H. C. Kimball married after his death? Who entered in upon the heritage of wives of Pres. G. A. Smith and Orson Pratt? Please tell me who obtained the wives of Joseph Smith? When and why?

One other thing will suffice for the present. If the question of your salvation or mine depended upon the character of Joseph Smith, my father, rather than upon our own acts, then the sentence you think betrays my hardness of heart might never have been written by me; but when you reflect that whatever Joseph Smith may have been personally, good or bad, is not to be the test when you and I are to be tried, you must admit that the issue is not whether Joseph Smith was a polygamist; but, is the doctrine of God?

I expect the truth to win in this controversy. If in the final arbitration I am found in error I shall submit. If in the right, as I now believe I am, I shall be content without being malicious.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH SMITH.

Lamoni, July 30th, 1888.

ELDER L. O. LITTLEFIELD'S REJOINER.

A REPLY TO THE THIRD LETTER OF JOSEPH SMITH, OF LAMONI.

Mr. Joseph Smith, Lamoni, Iowa.

SIR:—In the opening portion of your third letter you reiterate your quotation from the words of the prophet Jacob wherein he, in the name and by the authority of Jehovah, forbids the Nephites to practice plural marriage. In a former letter I answered your arguments derived from the words of Jacob. I showed clearly the hopelessness of any attempt on your part to sustain your opposition to plural marriage from them. And yet you reiterate the same quotations and the same arguments. You cling to these words of Jacob as a drowning man clings to a straw, and probably flatter yourself that in so doing great praise is due to you for holding on so firmly to the iron rod of God's word.

Mr. Smith, you are not frank nor ingenious in the use you make of the words of Jacob. You do not quote and apply them in full. You select the sentences that suit your purpose and weave them into an argument designed to sustain your position. You are like the man who declared he could prove from the teachings of Paul that it was right to steal. When asked for the passage he quoted from Eph. 4, 28, the words: Let him that stole, steal, omitting the words "no more."

It is true that Jacob reproved the Nephites for their sexual corruption. The nature of that corruption I explained in a former letter. It consisted in part of fornication, whoredom and adultery. But the marriage system, laws and ordinances under which the patriarchs and prophets of the Hebrew race married plural wives, was unknown among the Nephites; hence it is impossible that the practice of that system could have been one of the sins for which Jacob so severely reproved them.

There are two kinds of plural marriage: One is pure, holy, heavenly; it came from God, it is controlled by His laws and ordinances, and is designed to elevate, purify, refine and perfect the human race. The other is low, degrading and corrupt; it had its origin in man's wickedness, and is calculated to debase, pollute and destroy mankind. They are as different in their natures and effects as light is from darkness, or virtue from vice. David for a long time practiced the former and was blessed; being tempted of the devil, he fell into the latter and was cursed with a sore cursing. Precisely so with Solomon. While he practiced righteous plural marriage he was favored of God as no man has ever been before or since; but when he took wives unlawfully, he too fell, and incurred the vengeance of God upon his head. What impartial reader of the Scriptures cannot see this great lesson in the lives of these two men, and the vast difference between right and wrong plural marriage? It was the latter not the former

or which the Nephites practiced, and which Jacob forbade. I admit that the dispensation of the gospel through Jacob was a strictly monogamous one. I admit that under it polygamy would have been a crime. But I do not admit that it was the dispensation of the fulness of times; that no later one should ever be given; nor that the marriage laws binding under it, were designed to be thereafter binding upon all peoples and nations for all time to come. Indeed Jacob himself foretells such an idea. After the tremendous rebuke which he administered to the Nephites because of their sexual sins, and after laying down with the most rigid strictness, the monogamic law unto them, he prophesied unto them. He foretells that the system he has just laid down to them is not to continue always. He predicts that in a future dispensation God will give further commandments to His people concerning their sexual relations. These are the words of his prophecy: "Wherefore, saith the Lord, if I will raise up seed unto me I will command my people; otherwise they shall hearken unto these things." (i.e. the monogamic law just given.)

These words of Jacob immediately follow those you quote. Why did you not quote them too? Was it not because that to do so would be to remove the keystone of the arch of your argument, and suffer the whole to fall to the ground? This sentence is in the nature of a prophecy, a revelation, that under the dispensation of the Gospel, in which God should choose to rear a peculiarly righteous seed unto Himself, to accomplish His own purpose in the earth, He would reveal to His people new laws concerning marriage. In the face of such a prophecy, how can you Mr. Smith, make it consistent with your conscience to hold that the marriage laws of Jacob were never to be changed or added to, and that the duty must be a changeable Being if He has caused to be fulfilled this prophecy which He inspired His servant to utter?

I have fully and completely answered all your arguments drawn from the words of Jacob. Doubtless, however, you will still cling to them for comfort and solace in your opposition to plural marriage; for if you yield them up as one of your weapons, you will not be able to cite, in all the Scriptures that have been given for the instruction, profit, learning, comfort and salvation of mankind, one single word, phrase or sentence that indicates the plural marriage system of the Latter-day Saints of Utah to be in conflict with the will or law of God.

In the fifth paragraph of your letter, you allude to Adam, Noah and Lehi, and because no record has survived the mutations of time, proving that they, during the period of their lives, had each but one wife, you set it down as "the opening count in the indictment" substantiating your position that God never intended a plurality of wives to be practiced. It is true the Creator started the peopling of the earth with Adam and Eve. He chose to commence that stupendous work with the two beings, to whom, no doubt, the right belonged. The commencement was indeed small. From two, millions descended. The stream of life widened and deepened as it flowed through the coming ages. The source of this stream was pure, and that it was corrupted by the time it reached the days of Noah, by abominations of men and women, is no argument against only just such a kind of polygamy as they themselves had introduced, to accommodate their lascivious desires. They had inaugurated it; God was not known in the matter, hence His anger was kindled against them, and the flood resulted. With Noah, who is sometimes called the second Adam, the earth seemed again, in some respects, to resume its pristine condition. Noah and his sons had but one wife each, so far as the Bible gives an account, and Lehi was in the same condition. But all this argues nothing against polygamy. There were other righteous and good men who lived in various dispensations who did not hold the keys of this ministry. And, sir, I write of no new "cosmos" when I declare to you that if these men were not thus favored, that Joseph Smith, your father, did receive from the Lord a dispensation of this ministry. You say the revelation of 1843 on celestial marriage is of "doubtful parentage," and you cannot accept it in evidence. Nevertheless it is God's eternal truth revealed through your father. You undertake to deny its authenticity by assertions amount-

ing to this: That this revelation was fabricated by President Brigham Young after your father's death, and hence your father was not a polygamist. In my last, I sufficiently disproved this position of yours by the affidavit of Elder David Fullmer, concerning which you make no allusion. This affidavit positively states that "on or about the twelfth day of August, A. D., 1843," this revelation on celestial marriage was, by your father's knowledge and consent, read before the High Council on that date assembled in the city of Nauvoo, by your now deceased and honored uncle Hyrum Smith. Your father's death occurred on the 27th day of June 1844. These dates show that this reading took place a little less than one year previous to Joseph Smith's death. This plainly relieves President Young from your charge and establishes the fact that that revelation was given through the agency of the Prophet Joseph. I have given you the names of women who were his wives. These ladies live in Utah, and sustain the highest credibility. They are willing to speak for themselves. As you have been a student at law, you should know something of the nature of evidence. But there is a saying, which I hope can have no application to you that "a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still." Now sir, do you admit that I have proven that your father did practice polygamy? I desire positively that you will answer this question. This was one of the main questions contemplated in my open letter. I there denied the position your conference took upon this point in the Kirtland Temple as being correct. You have introduced many side issues and seem disposed to dodge this main question. I call you back to it again. This and the question of Temple building were among my original questions. Before you ramble quite all over creation expecting me to follow, I ask you to say "yes" or "no" as to whether you are or are not convinced that your father practiced plurality.

Abraham was not a polygamist you declare. In contradiction to all histories and commentators who have left their testimony on the historic page, it has been reserved for Joseph Smith, of Lamoni, to make this announcement. To prove that Abraham was a polygamist let me call the attention of the reader to the sixteenth chapter of Genesis. The touching history of Hagar and the solicitude of the Heavenly Father for the child Ishmael, and the fact that Ishmael was numbered among the seed of Abraham, all go to show that God recognized them as being of the family of Abraham. And to disprove your assertion that Hagar was given to Abraham by Sarai only, let me quote Josephus, Ant. B. 1. C. 10: "Accordingly Sarai at God's command, brought to his bed one of her handmaids, a woman of Egyptian descent, in order to obtain children by her." As God commanded this the matter is disposed of in favor of polygamy.

And "Moses was not a polygamist" you say. From the second chapter of Exodus we learn that Moses took Zipporah to wife, and in the twelfth chapter of Numbers we read of his marrying and Ethiopian woman. I hope my readers will read these passages and satisfy themselves how unwarrantable is your assertion when you confound these two women together and say that they were one and the same person. These were the two wives of Moses, thus making him a polygamist, and when Aaron and Miriam took occasion to speak against Moses concerning this matter the anger of the Lord was kindled against them and Miriam became leprous.

"Isaac's life affords you no comfort. Rebecca must have ruled her house in respect to her husband's wives, as Joseph Smith's wife, Emma, would have done, if he had not, as you assert, secretly sinned against her."

Isaac's life affords me no discouragement at least. How Rebecca ruled is not important for me to discuss. How Emma Smith would have ruled, does not call for criticism from me; but the close of the sentence just quoted requires some explanation. I am not aware that anything I have written during this controversy will justify the implication that Joseph Smith the Prophet, never sinned secretly against his wife, Emma, or any other being. I know not that in any transaction of his, in the order of celestial marriage, he sinned against your mother. Have you understood me to say, directly or indirectly, that your father took wives unknown to

your mother? If he did so, I did not know concerning it. But I will positively state that during the residence at Nauvoo, your mother, Emma, was present when at least four of his wives were sealed to him, to which she gave her consent. Positive evidence can be produced to this effect.

Here is a little of it: First the statement of your cousin, Lovina Walker, the daughter of the Patriarch Hyrum Smith:

CERTIFICATE.

I, Lovina Walker, hereby certify that while I was living with Aunt Emma Smith, in Fulton City, Fulton Co., Ill., in the year 1846, she told me that she, Emma Smith, was present and witnessed the marrying or sealing of Eliza Partridge, Emily Partridge, Maria Lawrence and Sarah Lawrence to her husband Joseph Smith, and that she gave her consent thereto.

LOVINA WALKER.

We hereby witness that Lovina Walker made and signed the above statement on this 16th day of June A. D. 1889, at Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, Utah Territory, of her own free will and accord.

HYRUM S. WALKER.

SARAH E. SMITH,

JOA. F. SMITH.

And next the affidavit of one of the ladies mentioned in the above certificate, confirming the fact of the presence of your mother at the time that she, the affiant, was sealed to your father.

AFFIDAVIT.

TERRITORY OF UTAH, } ss.

County of Salt Lake }

Be it remembered that on the first day of May, A. D. 1868, personally appeared before me, Elias Smith, Judge of Probate for said county, Emily Dow Partridge Young, who was by me sworn in due form of law, and upon her oath said that on the eleventh day of May, A. D. 1848, at the City of Nauvoo, County of Hancock, State of Illinois, she was married or sealed to Joseph Smith, President of the Church of Jesus Christ, of Latter-day saints, by James Adams, a High Priest in said Church; according to the laws of the same regulating marriage; in the presence of Emma (Hale) Smith, and Eliza Maria Partridge (Lyman).

EMILY D. P. YOUNG.

Subscribed and sworn

to by the said Emily D. P. Young, the day and year first above written.

E. SMITH,

Probate Judge.

Hence the Prophet did not "secretly" sin against his wife Emma.

You will observe that the above affiant states that she was married to your father on May 11, 1848, while the revelation on plural marriage, as subsequently published, bears date of July 12th, 1843. By means of the revelation the law of plural marriage was given to the Church, but long prior to its date, the principle was revealed to your father, and he was commanded to practice it.

"The case of Joseph is only favorable to your view in seeming. He was the son of Rachel, the only legal wife Jacob had."

I am pleased that you thus admit Rachel was Jacob's legal wife; at the same time it is evident she was his second wife. Leah was Jacob's wife seven years before Rachel became his wife. Each of these wives had a handmaid, which they gave to their husband for wives: Gen. 29, 18-35. Chap. 30, 8-12. Hence Joseph's birth was polygamous, and yet the Lord has respect unto him and great blessings were placed upon him. Gen. 49, 22-20.

Nothing that I have said in this debate gives you the right to infer that I hold that there is or ever was any law or rule in connection with the principle of plural marriage, which makes it obligatory upon the successor of a king, or of an officer in the Church, to marry the widows of his predecessor. Among the Latter-day Saints of Utah, and under the system of plural marriage as they understand and practice it, a widow may marry whom she chooses, or refrain from marrying at her option, no matter what position her husband held. This is a sufficient reply to your inquiries respecting the widows of the prominent men to whom you refer.

Allow me here to conclude my present reply and subscribe myself,

Your well-wisher,

L. O. LITTLEFIELD.

LOGAN, Utah, Sept. 8, 1888.

BY TELEGRAPH.

THE WASHINGTON UNION TELEGRAPH LITERARY

AMERICAN.

St. Johns, N. F., 12.—The first officer of the Proteus briefly summarizes the ill-fated Proteus expedition as follows: "The Yantic and Proteus left St. Johns at 4 p.m. on June 34th. The Proteus arrived at Good Haven Bay, Disco Island, July 6th, the Yantic at the same place July 12th. Necessary preparations were made, and the Proteus sailed for Cory Island, arriving on the 16th. She left on the 21st, and two days afterwards was crushed, sinking at 7 p.m. July 23rd. Twenty-nine days were spent in boats. Several storms were encountered, from which the boat took refuge under the lee of icebergs. Lieut. Caldwell and six of the crew parted company with the others at Cape York. Found the Yantic July 31st, and reported to Captain Pike, the remainder of the crew moving southward. The Yantic reached Cory Island August 2d. The same night she proceeded to Pandora Harbor, where the record from Pike and Garlington was found. She next proceeded south along the Greenland coast, sending boats all round the island searching for the missing crew. A storm and heavy packed ice on August 9th forced the Yantic to anchor to the leeward of Northumberland Island. Next day she bore away for Upernavik, arriving there August 13th. On the 27th she started for Walgate coal mines, and returned to Upernavik September 2d. Capt. Pike and crew were found and taken on board the Yantic. It seems the first intimation of the Proteus disaster was found August 3d at Littleton Island by the Yantic. Lieut. Garlington left a record there coming south, describing the shipwreck and indicating the general movement to Capt. Pike and the ship's company. On the 4th search was instituted along the Greenland Coast from Cape Alexander to Cape Robertson; every point likely to bring up with the retreating party was searched till September 2d, when the Upernavik was reached and the whole Proteus party found in good health and tolerable spirits. They were exposed during 31 days and nights in their boats, making some stoppages at intermediate points. The Proteus was crushed in a floe of ice at 8 in the evening of the 23d of July, and sank in four hours. As the closed floes parted company, fortunately sufficient time was given to save clothing, provisions, compass, and other necessities to meet what might prove a protracted voyage. On the 25th the boats being equipped, provisioned and manned, a start was made. The scene of the disaster was eight miles northeast of Cape Sabine, latitude 71:51 north. Over 600 miles of sea and frigid sea were passed before Upernavik was reached. The worst feature in the unfortunate Proteus expedition is that no provisions were landed or caches made, and all the stores intended for the Arctic colony relief went down in the steamer.

When at anchor in the Danish harbor on the 12th of August, Gen. E. burz came on board the Yantic, and reported that the Danish steamer Sophia had arrived there from a harbor 30 miles north of Cape York, and the captain stated the natives Ekimos told him two natives with the Greeley expedition arrived on sledges last winter and reported the party all well except Dr. Favy, who had died. The natives went back to Lady Franklin Bay.

Another Eskimo arriving from the Greeley camp reported that the officers murdered by the men. Neither of these reports is reliable, as the fondness of the Eskimos for lying and sensationalism places them in the category of fiction. Capt. Sabine says that as far north as Cape Sabine there was no trace of Greeley or his party, and his failure to come south to Littleton Island to meet the relief steamer this summer works grave apprehensions as to their probable fate.

The Proteus was retreating home when the ice overwhelmed her, she got barely fifteen miles north of the scene of the shipwreck. The prospects of the Greeley colony encountering the rigors of a fourth winter beneath the Arctic circle are mournful to contemplate.

The crews of both the ships Yantic and Proteus are in excellent health. One death only occurred during the expedition, that of Henry Wilson, gunner's mate of the Yantic, of shingles.

New York, N.—The following